Beyond Persephone: A Study of the Twice-Told Tales in
Ovid's *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses*

Emily J. Goode

UCL – PhD

I, Emily J. Goode confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

_____

Abstract

There are several narratives told by Ovid in both the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* and, excluding the rape of Persephone, there has been little or no analysis of them. This thesis is the first focused comparison of all of the twice-told tales in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*. This thesis presents a close-reading of four of the most substantial twice-told tales, the rape of Callisto, the rape of Europa, the apotheosis of Romulus, and the death of Hippolytus. We find that the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* are woven together with strong invitations to compare between the two texts. Broadly this thesis finds that genre and, in particular, interest in divine action is an important distinguishing feature between the twice-told tales; divine action being present to a greater degree in the *Metamorphoses* narratives. This thesis then surveys the remaining twice-told tales with an emphasis on their position within the text. Here we find that the twice-told tales are positioned so as to increase the intertextual pull between the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*.

Comparison of the twice-told tales also reveals insights into the individual texts, and in this respect the *Fasti*, as the lesser investigated of the two texts, particularly benefits. We argue that the twice-told tales in the *Fasti* reveal that the *Fasti* is a text characterised by the flux of genre and tone. Sexual comedy, a theme found to be present in several twice-told tales, is an important part of the way the *Fasti* maintains this flux.

Comparison of twice-told narratives is then complemented by a comparison of a non-narrative discourse on animal sacrifice. This thesis demonstrates that comparison of this non-narrative episode is both invited with strong verbal echoes, and reveals useful insights into the two versions. Non-narrative operates in a similar way to narrative in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*.

Table of Contents

Introduction

> 'Life is as tedious as a twice-told tale
> Vexing the dull ear of a drowsy man.'
>
> William Shakespeare, *King John,* Act 3 scene 4

There are several twice-told tales in Ovid; they are never (despite Lewis' opinion in *King John*) tedious but they are vexatious: excluding the rape of Persephone, little or no comparison of them has taken place and any relationship between them has scarcely been examined. This thesis will be the first focused analysis of all of the twice-told tales in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*.

Some have doubted that the twice-told tales in Ovid should be examined. As recently as 1996 one critic called the comparison of the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* 'unfair and misleading' (Johnson: 15).[1] However Johnson himself was unable to avoid making comparisons demonstrating that comparison can be irresistible.[2]

Little also considered the comparison of these two texts to be a misguided venture, particularly as relates to a comparison of genre. As the *Fasti* is an aetiological poem whilst the *Metamorphoses* engages with Graeco-Roman myths, comparison is, in his opinion, unjustifiable because 'it is self-evident that such a fundamental difference must result in a different sort of poem, of style, of narrative' (Little 1970: 69). However, it is precisely these points that this thesis wishes to consider: how the function of the poem changes (or does not) Ovid's way of telling a tale in terms of his style, his narration, his diction, his imagery, in fact all the facets of literary composition. As we shall see a comparative

---

[1] It is Johnson's concern that comparison between twice-told tales leads these tales to be read 'in isolation from [their] thematic networks' (1996: 15). This thesis will argue that comparison does not necessarily lead to isolation of these tales from their respective texts, indeed it can enhance our appreciation of the wider context.

[2] Johnson, (1996) on the differences in the reader's understanding of Diana's reaction to Callisto in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* (16), and on the different ways that Ovid subverts the 'patriarchal version' of the Callisto myth (21f).

reading will elucidate each twice-told tale, and improve our understanding of the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* more widely.

If we accept that a comparison of these two Ovidian texts is a valid methodology, another question arises: 'why compare the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* rather than any of Ovid's other works'? It is certainly possible to compare other works by Ovid,[3] but there are several reasons why a comparison between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* is the most inviting. The supposed similar time of composition means it is possible that Ovid was composing them simultaneously. Ovid had promised in his introduction to the *Metamorphoses*, 'di, coeptis (nam vos mutastis et illas)/ adspirate meis primaque ab origine mundi/ ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen!' (*M*.1.2-4) and, as the first word of the *Fasti* is 'tempora', critics see the *Fasti* as a fulfilment of the declaration that opens the *Metamorphoses*.[4] 'Tempora' provides a strong invitation to read the two texts together.

We may also consider that Ovid invites comparison when he tells the same stories in both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*. The *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* share not only the longest example of a story told twice by Ovid (the rape of Persephone) but also the greatest number of examples: the rape of Callisto, the rape of Europa, the apotheosis of Romulus, the death of Hippolytus, the apotheosis of Julius Caesar, Tatius' siege of Rome and others. These twice-told tales may also come as something of a surprise to the reader; although one might expect a little overlap of material on Roman history, the amount of Greek stories told-twice is unexpected. Ovid was under no compulsion to retell stories in both the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* and that he did so constitutes a very strong invitation for comparison. That he uses similar and even identical diction in the two versions makes this invitation still more compelling. This thesis will consider the effects of these intertextual links[5] on our reading. Context is, of

---

[3] For example the story of Daedalus and Icarus told in the *Metamorphoses* (*M*.8.183-235) and the *Ars Amatoria* (2.21-98).
[4] See Barchiesi (1991), Hardie (1993), and Wheeler (1999).
[5] This thesis notes Sharrock's anxiety that intertextuality, particularly between the works of a single author, can also be viewed by the reader as intratextuality (2000: 24-5). However for the purposes of this thesis the term 'intertextuality' will be used.

course, essential[6] and this thesis will endeavour to highlight both the conventional teleological drive of the *Metamorphoses* and the calendrical order of the *Fasti,* against the disruptive intertextual pull of the twice-told tales.

The question 'should we compare the twice-told tales in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*?' is much more easily answered than the question 'how should we compare the twice-told tales in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*?'. To attempt to answer this question it will be useful to trace the critical tradition of comparing the twice-told tales in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*.

In 1919 a new method of exploring Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* was born with Richard Heinze's paper 'Ovids Elegische Erzählung'.[7] Heinze's novel idea was to compare the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* and to use his findings to identify the essential differences between the two texts. Focusing primarily on the rape of Persephone, the longest twice-told tale, Heinze sought to demonstrate that the principal difference in the narrative style of the two rapes of Persephone was determined by their genre; the *Metamorphoses* version was epic and the *Fasti* version was elegiac and as such each employed a style appropriate to their genre. Heinze then went further and attempted to extrapolate from these differences the characteristics of epic and elegy as a whole.

Heinze characterised the Persephone narrative in the *Metamorphoses* (and tacitly epic as a whole) as 'active', objective, grandiose, highlighting godly majesty, energetic, with a solemn dignity, and concise. He defined the Persephone story in the *Fasti* (and tacitly elegy as a whole) as 'passive', subjective and personal, idyllic, with little discernible rhetoric, dampening the majesty of the gods, more lively, and concerned with grief and mourning.[8]

---

[6] Johnson's point that the individual stories in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* suffer when taken out of context is well made (1996: 15).
[7] Reprinted in 1960. The references in this thesis are to this edition.
[8] Heinze also thought he could distinguish a generic difference between descriptions of countryside in which rape scenes take place (1960: 313-4).

Heinze's statement of his position can most easily be seen in the following quote:[9]

> 'In der Metamorphosenerzählung herrschen starke aktive Affekte, jähe Liebe und jäher Zorn, in der Fastenerzählung weichere Empfindungen, schmerzliche Klage und Mitleid. In den Metamorphosen ist die göttliche Majestät der Personen geflissentlich gesteigert; in den Fasten wird die Gottheit vermenschlicht. Die Schilderung der Metamorphosen bevorzugt das Grandiose, die der Fasten das idyllisch Anheimelnde. Der Stil der Erzählung wahrt in den Metamorphosen eine gewisse feierliche Würde; der der Fasten ist lebendiger, beweglicher; jener hält streng fest an der Objektivität der Rhapsoden; die Fasten lassen die Persönlichkeit des Erzählers und seinen Gegenwartsstandpunkt mehr hervortreten.' (Heinze 1960: 315)

After surveying the rape of Persephone,[10] Heinze examines, more briefly, a wide spectrum of features of the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* from Ovidian gods to the rape of the Sabines; Romulus and his apotheoses to the catasterism of Orion; Remus to Tarquin. To all of these he applies his elegiac and epic criteria as a distinction between the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses*, and sees these narratives enforce his generic distinctions.

Heinze's conception of the generic identity of the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* was unchallenged until 1963 with the publication of Tränkle's 'Elegisches in Ovids Metamorphosen' (1963: 459-75). Tränkle proposed that the epic/elegiac distinction between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* could not be as clear-cut as Heinze suggested. Then in 1967 Bernbeck published an article more broadly criticising Heinze's reading of the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*. Bernbeck argues that the *Metamorphoses*' style is playful, avoids the usual epic *gravitas*, and is filled with rhetorical devices such as zeugma, parentheses and antonomasia. The narrative style, Bernbeck argues, is coloured with abrupt transitions, the intrusion of place descriptions, antithesis, and removal of detail (1967: 128). Bernbeck is vehement that the gods in the *Metamorphoses* are not the majestic creatures that

---

[9] Also noticed by Little (1970: 65).

[10] Heinze's comparison of the narrative of the two rapes of Persephone does highlight some interesting phenomena: Pluto is well described in *M*.5.356-363; 395; 402-404 and skimmed over in the *F*.4.445-6 (Heinze 1960: 312); the famine inflicted by Ceres is more prominent in the *Metamorphoses* (*M*.5476ff. and *F*.4.615-618); Jupiter's speech does vary between the two versions (*M*.5.523-532, *F*.4.597-604) (Heinze 1960: 311).

Heinze paints. (We will see Jupiter's penchant for disguises (as Diana and a bull) made humorous by Ovid in later chapters.) Bernbeck also considered the lack of ancient evidence for Heinze's genre definitions to be a crucial flaw in his methodology.

The first to deconstruct Heinze's paper *in toto* was Little in 1970.[11] His paper poses a challenge to the fundamental approach of Heinze's project: that comparison between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, particularly a comparison of genre, is not a valid exercise:

> 'Heinze's whole thesis, that there is a difference in content, tone and style between the way a myth is narrated in elegy and the way the same myth is narrated in "epic" presupposes such adaptation...[A particular detail of myth] is not present, nor is it absent, because Ovid thought the laws of genre demanded it, but because Ovid thought it was an effective, or inappropriate, component of the tale he was telling at that particular time.' (Little 1970: 97)

Little states that the *Fasti* is an aetiological poem whilst the *Metamorphoses* engages with Graeco-Roman myths (Little 1970: 69). Because of this, Little argues, 'It is self-evident that such a fundamental difference must result in a different sort of poem, of style, of narrative' (Little 1970: 69). However, Little believes that these differences prevent the formation of 'a proper basis of comparison' (1970: 70) between the two texts. He further asserts that Ovid, when stating the purpose of the *Fasti* (in *F*.3.723-726)[12] does so 'in terms which seem intentionally to distance it from the *Metamorphoses*' (1970: 70).

---

[11] Little makes a number of telling points against Heinze: Heinze fails to qualify his elegiac and epic parameters sufficiently when transferring them from the rapes of Persephone to the rest of the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* (Little 1970: 65); Heinze fails to explain why love affairs were unavoidable in the plan of the *Metamorphoses* (Little 1970: 93); Heinze assumes but does not prove that the *Metamorphoses* was an epic (Little 1970: 71); Heinze uses the terms 'epic' and 'hexameter' interchangeably when they are not interchangeable (Little 1970: 73); Heinze ignores his own point that not every poem that has heroic elements is heroic throughout (Little 1970: 74); Heinze's distinctions between active grief and passive internal grief are unclear (Little 1970: 77-8); Heinze misrepresents the gods in the *Metamorphoses* by presenting them as sublime (Little 1970: 92) (as already argued by Bernbeck).

[12] 'ecce libet subitos pisces Tyrrhenaque monstra/ dicere, sed non est carminis huius opus./ carminis huius opus causas exponere, quare/ vilis anus populos ad sua liba vocet' (*F*.3.723-726).

After Little's comprehensive critique of Heinze work on the comparison of the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* languished[13] and it was not until 1987 that this field of study was revitalised when Hinds proposed that 'Heinze did ask the right questions even if he came up with some of the wrong answers' (1987: xii). Hinds engages in close reading and comparison of the rapes of Persephone and argues that comparison between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* is not only a useful critical tool, it may be actively invited.[14]

> 'The invitation to compare and contrast the two poems goes right back to the beginning of each. The narrative of the *Metamorphoses* opens, in accordance with its professed intention (*M.*1.3-4), with an account of the origin of the universe, presented by Ovid as the transformation of Chaos (*M.*1.5-7). The *Fasti* opens, in accordance with its professed intention (*F.*1.1), with an account of the first day of the calendar year, the Kalends of January, in the form of a dialogue between Ovid and the god Janus. However in [*F.*1.103]… we learn that he has an alias 'me Chaos antiqui (nam sum res prisca) vocabant'.' (1987: 42-3)

Hinds also reassesses Heinze's paper more generally. He notes that what Heinze actually succeeded in doing by comparing Ovid's twin stories (Hinds' term for the twice-told tales) was rendering Ovid's narrative technique more observable (1987: 101).[15] However Hinds distances himself from Heinze's strict epic/elegiac opposition (Hinds 1987: 113) and allows for a much more flexible system of generic distinction than Heinze.[16] However, Hinds argues that generic

---

[13] Subsequent scholarship still had some comments to make about Heinze's arguments, after Little. Galinsky identifies that even after Heinze's theories are rejected the 'epic/non-epic' question remains prominent in *Metamorphoses* criticism (Galinsky 1975: viii). Barsby notes that Heinze neglected comparison within elegy, for example the Sabine rape *Ars.* 1.10ff. and *F.*3.179ff (1978: 27), and within epic, for example with the *Aeneid* (Barsby 1978: 31). He also lists examples of the different genres he identifies in the *Fasti* including: epic, tragedy, comedy, bucolic, fable, novella, and satire (Barsby 1978: 27). He further notes that the *Metamorphoses* is not 'objective'; the *Aeneid* could reasonably be termed 'subjective' (Barsby 1978: 31). Knox studies the low language used by Ovid in the *Metamorphoses* and notes that Ovid used metrical patterns common in elegy in the *Metamorphoses* (Knox 1986: 86-7).

[14] One specific example in the rapes of Persephone comes when Hinds establishes an allusion, previously unremarked, to Ceres as a maenad at *M.*5.509-11 by cross-reference to *F.*4.455-8. References to *F.*4.455-8 in the *Metamorphoses* text endorse this reading (Hinds 1987: 74-5).

[15] He also provides here a list of the most important rebuttals to Heinze's arguments.

[16] Epic for Hinds is associated with the divine and the grand. Hence grand dwellings, divine punishment, grand cosmic plans, general emphasis on divinity and language connected with military are all elements that for him confirm the *Metamorphoses*' rape of Persephone as following epic norms. In the *Fasti* version of Persephone Hinds establishes that grief and lamentation are intimately connected with elegy, as is a general avoidance of epic scale and values (1987: 112). Technical language can also highlight the generic difference such as *alternis*, used in *F.*2.121 or 'levis' and 'dura', or play between the characteristics of the metrical balance

distinctions are important to the rapes in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*, 'Not only when they are being observed, but also when they are being transgressed, boundaries of genre will be argued to be essential to the presentation of *M*.5.341ff and *F*.4.417ff.' (Hinds 1987: 102).

However Hinds only surveys the rapes of Persephone, he does not venture into the other twice-told tales. He also militates against any simple extension of his findings to the rest of the texts and indeed implies that the rapes of Persephone may not correspond to the rest of the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* (1987: 101).[17]

Since Hinds 1987 re-established comparison of the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* there have been some (although not many) further contributions to the field. In 1996 an article by Johnson examined the twice-told rapes of Callisto. However, Johnson echoed Little's position, calling comparison of the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* accounts 'unfair and misleading', (1996: 15) arguing that the episodes in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* suffer when not read in the wider context of their texts.[18] This point is fair, as lack of sympathy with the wider context of each twice-told tale can be injurious to full appreciation of the nuances of the texts.

However Johnson also seems to equate comparison specifically with Heinze and as such rejects the technique of comparison 'I'm not…interested in a game *a la* Heinze of invidious comparison' (1996: 19). He says this despite the fact that he is unable to prevent himself from making comparison between the two Ovidian versions of Callisto. Johnson has either confused a narrative comparison with the

---

and response (such as antithesis within elegiac couplets opposed to the greater flexibility of caesura, end stop and enjambment of hexameter). At points Hinds is influenced by Heinze's vocabulary and, given the general imprecision of Heinze's terminology, this lessens the impact of Hinds' points. For example, Hinds describes Jupiter in the *Metamorphoses* 'as the more energetic apologist' (1987: 73) and Ceres' anger is 'active' in the *Metamorphoses* (1987: 106).

[17] In his review of Hinds, Nicoll argues that the vital question is the applicability of Hinds' findings to the rest of the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* (1988: 246).

[18] This position gives rise to difficulties in understanding the paper. As Johnson does not make clear until the ninth page of the article (1996: 17) that he is tackling the rapes of Callisto because Richlin omitted to study them, the majority of the paper appears to be dealing with two paralleled rapes and the question arises; if he disapproves of comparison, why is he examining them? Johnson's position becomes more unnatural when he declares that in the *Fasti*'s Callisto 'we begin to remember (at the same time we listen to this Callisto) how the poet handled the same story in his longer poem, and we wonder how he will contrive to charm us this time' (1996: 20). So Johnson is supposing that the reader compares, and yet critics are disallowed from studying the effects of this comparison?

generic comparison proposed by Heinze or he rejects the proposition that our understanding of Ovid's texts may benefit from an intertextual approach (and yet he does just that).[19]

Later critics begin, like Hinds, to see that comparison between the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* can be put to meritable use, and is not the blunt tool it became in Heinze's hands. Work focusing particularly on Romulus' twice-told apotheosis was carried out in 2002 by Gosling. This useful article close-reads both passages comparatively with interesting results. Gosling goes beyond this to posit that Ovid's two versions form a synthesis, commenting on the Romulus of both texts (Gosling 2002: 53). This is an intriguing idea, that this twice-told tale (or indeed any of the twice-told tales) comes together outside of the texts of the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* to form a sort of meta-text. We will examine the potential for increased understanding of the texts through their comparison.

The most recent development on this academic pitch came in 2005 by Murgatroyd. Although Murgatroyd's focus was the *Fasti* he devotes chapter eight of his book to 'Ovid and Ovid' (2005: 235-267). He examines most of the twice-told tales, albeit briefly. This thesis will look closely at Murgatroyd's findings in our discussions of each twice-told tale. As Murgatroyd's focus is the *Fasti* he notes that, quite aside from its potential relationship to the *Metamorphoses*, the *Fasti* is rich in intratextual linkage, 'these internal links are used as a structural device to pull together all six books, to establish two groups of three books each, and to set up patterns' (Murgatroyd 2005: 252). The main techniques which Murgatroyd identifies Ovid using to create intratextual links are similarity or repetition of diction, repetition of plot, stories of a type being told regularly (Murgatroyd 2005: 252). These types of techniques, when used in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti,* will be the main investigative thrust of this thesis. Overall Murgatroyd's opinion on why the reader enjoys the twice-told tales is a telling one, 'when we realise that the poet is returning to an anecdote

---

[19] Johnson, (1996) on the differences in the reader's understanding of Diana's reaction to Callisto in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* (16), and on the different ways that Ovid subverts the 'patriarchal version' of the Callisto myth (21f).

we are drawn in, to see what alterations we can detect, to savour the subtlety, clever-ness etc' (Murgatroyd 2005: 236).

We have now examined the development of the major critical opinion in this field of study. We have seen it transform from Heinze's 'cut and dried' generic distinctions, through Little's denial of its usefulness, to Hinds' revival and re-evaluation, and beyond. There remains one element of critical opinion particularly pertinent to survey: scholarly understanding of the use of contrasting genre and tone within the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*.

The generic complexity and tonal variety of the *Metamorphoses* is well understood. Indeed many scholars have argued as to whether the *Metamorphoses* itself constitutes a proper epic (Little, for one example, criticised Heinze for the assumption that the *Metamorphoses* was an epic text (1970: 71)). The general critical consensus is that the *Metamorphoses,* though not a perfect paradigm of epic, does belong to that category. It is also widely appreciated that the *Metamorphoses* borrows from a wide variety of genres: 'elements characteristic of elegy, bucolic, didactic, tragedy, comedy and oratory mingle with elements variously characteristic of the grand epic tradition and with each other' (Hinds 1987: 121). 'The [*Metamorphoses*] frequently changes style and tone. Unity and continuity are achieved mainly through Ovid's narrative control and his technique of self-consciously drawing attention to the mechanisms of his narrative' (Myers 2009: 2).

The tonal and generic complexity of the *Fasti* is less and more recently understood than that of the *Metamorphoses*. A simple epic/elegiac contrast within the *Fasti* has in some measure been promoted by Heinze's contrast of the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses.* Subsequent critics who disagreed with and developed Heinze's thesis have also often focused upon the epic/elegiac distinction (for example Hinds). In 1987 Hinds argued that the majority of the strain upon the *Fasti*'s elegiac genre came from the direction of epic (1987: 121). Indeed as we shall see, particularly in the apotheoses of Romulus, the *Fasti*'s elegy does seem to strain under the weight of its epic material. In 1992, however, Hinds reviewed his position on the *Fasti* somewhat. He published two additional essays on *arma*

in the *Fasti*, in which he contends that the epic/elegy opposition is not sufficient to explain the forces at work in this text. He proposes that epic, insofar as it is associated with *arma*, is placed in opposition not only with the conventional Augustan *mollities* of elegy, but also with *sacra* and *sidera*. (Hinds 1992: 113). He also further contends that where these three elements are associated and contrasted with elegiac themes,[20] and the elegiac text of the *Fasti* more generally, that it does not deflate the grandeur of the epic elements, rather that it shows the *Fasti*'s aspirations (Hinds 1992: 113).[21]

Other critics have also commented on the piecemeal and contrary nature of the *Fasti*; one example is Newlands; she describes the genre of the *Fasti* thus:

> 'Indeed the expansion of this new audacious elegiac genre to encompass imperial as well as erotic themes permits a broader and more thorough play with Roman values and ideas about the past and invites to look at them in constantly shifting lights. The range of tones which this new form of elegy encompasses – from exegetical to bawdy, from sorrowful to grand, - puts into question any authoritarian view of the past as a repository of values crucial in shaping Roman values.' (1995: 16)

Although some scholars have noted the presence of 'bawdy' (to use Newlands' word) elements in the *Fasti* (see Fantham 1983 and Barchiesi 1997: 238-256), overall this element has been little integrated into understanding of the *Fasti* as a

---

[20] In his 1992 paper Hinds continues the work commenced in 1987 on the role of lamentation in the *Fasti*. His argument then was that the *Fasti* used lamentation to create a more elegiac tone for the *Fasti*'s version of the rape of Persephone when in direct contrast with the *Metamorphoses* version. He extends this argument in this paper, to contend that the *Fasti* uses lamentation not only to balance against the epic elements of the *Metamorphoses* but also to balance against the epic elements contained in the *Fasti* itself. The example Hinds uses is the grief of the Sabine women, and the crying of the infants effectively halting the battle between the Sabine men and the Romans (Hinds 1992: 107).

[21] This is an important point. Whereas other critics (such as Barchiesi) see a contamination occurring between the less elevated and the more elevated elements of the *Fasti* (see below), Hinds instead sees these elements as striving to elevate those lesser elements. However, like Barchiesi later, Hinds also defines genre as 'a dynamic principle, not a static one, which involves here not just observance but also creative transgression of the expected bounds of elegy' (Hinds 1992: 82). Similarly in 1997 Barchiesi discusses the question of generic interaction, although without mentioning Heinze (1997: 65-8). For Barchiesi the traditional way of looking at problematised genre was 'a tradition of interchange, of grafting and of hybridisation between genres' (1997: 65), whereas Barchiesi argues that problematised genre is, in fact, 'drawing our attention to the difficulty of creating a dialogue between [literary genres]' (1997: 66). This thesis discerns a difficult dialogue between the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*; one which promotes flux in both texts.

whole.[22] As well as instances of bawdy humour there are also aetiological and etymological investigations peppered throughout the *Fasti*, including the apotheosis of Romulus. The *Fasti* here seems to engage with a different subset of elegy, the antiquarian, didactic form found, for example, in Callimachus' *Aetia* and Propertius Four.[23] Although this latter example of the variety of the *Fasti* has been more discussed amongst scholars the emphasis in *Fasti* scholarship still often remains upon the epic/elegiac dichotomy (one example is Merli 2000). This is something this thesis will seek to address; a comparison of the twice-told tales demonstrates the breadth of tonal variety in the *Fasti*.

This thesis will be the first time that the fluctuating tone of the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* has been shown to be also born out through the twice-told tales. The tales themselves present a wide disparity in type, and provide the vastly different comparisons between the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*.[24] Indeed the very variety of the twice-told tales suggests an invitation for the reader to remark upon the sheer variousness of the two texts. We will see that Hinds' 1987 distinctions between the two rapes of Persephone do not hold universally true for the other twice-told tales. We will, however, make some attempt to identify consistent differences between the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* twice-told tales.

This thesis is arranged in six chapters; the first four provide an in-depth comparison of one twice-told tale each. The fifth chapter examines the remaining twice-told tales and in particular their structural arrangement in the

---

[22] Hinds himself noted in 1992, 'tensions of generic definition constitute one important and (by most modern scholars) neglected element in the *Fasti*'s interpenetrative patterns of artistic overdetermination' (Hinds 1992: 91).

[23] Barchiesi compares the *Fasti* to the *Aetia*, believing that the *Fasti* cannot help but be reminiscent of the *Aetia*, covering similar themes and (so Barchiesi asserts) of a similar length (Barchiesi 1997: 73). This leads Barchiesi to posit that the *Fasti* is a text asking to be read two ways: both on a day-by-day basis, and also cumulatively like the *Aetia*. This cumulative reading, in Barchiesi's opinion, 'destroys the primary order, it creates a new second order' (Barchiesi 1997: 79). Barchiesi tends to be a 'suspicious' critic using this technique of cumulative reading to find anti-Augustan undertones. However his point still stands, regardless of the interpretation one chooses to make, the *Fasti* can be read both synchronically and diachronically. This makes the *Fasti* a rich and complex text in and of itself. In contrast with the *Metamorphoses* it becomes even richer; the intertextual pull across the two texts creates a sophisticated dialogue.

[24] Humour, to take one example, being much more prominent in the version of Callisto's rape in the *Fasti*, but the *Metamorphoses* version of Europa's rape. See chapter two and three for further detail.

Metamorphoses and *Fasti.* In the sixth chapter we move from examining twice-told tales to comparison of non-narrative discourse.

Chapter One engages in a close reading of the apotheoses of Romulus. This thesis demonstrates through close reading that there is considerable intertextuality between these two tales, constituting a strong invitation to read them together, which throws greater emphasis on their different endings. This chapter also addresses the tensions between the epic and elegiac genres inherent in this twice-told tale. We do so partly because this is the traditional way to compare the twice-told tales (and as such is a useful starting point), but also because the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* are, so this thesis argues, particularly engaging with generic play. We examine the characterisation of Romulus and Mars and demonstrate that the latter is at the crux of a considerable proportion of the generic play in the *Metamorphoses.* Mars' speech, in particular, is an important point of comparison between the two texts. This thesis demonstrates that the *Fasti* uses many traditional epic motifs in its version of Romulus' apotheosis, and brings its elegy almost to breaking point. The *Metamorphoses* complicates its tale with a strong intertext with the *Fasti* and a meta-poetic statement of elegiac intent.

In Chapter Two we turn to examine the twice-told tale of the rape of Callisto. Comparison reveals the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* to adopt strikingly different approaches to this rape. Yet still we find strong invitations to compare between the two versions and this thesis will argue that, in one particularly fascinating moment, Jupiter (dressed as Diana) in the *Metamorphoses* borrows Diana's words from the *Fasti* to make his disguise more convincing.

Genre, which was integral to our investigations in Chapter One remains an important, but not central, consideration. The *Fasti* does not strive for epic style in this twice-told tale, as it did in the apotheosis of Romulus; there is less emphasis on a genre struggle in the rape of Callisto. Instead of genre this thesis argues that gender and gender play are essential to our understanding of Callisto's rape. In the *Metamorphoses* Callisto's physicality and femininity are

consistently highlighted. Jupiter (as the rapist) will be shown to be an important presence in the *Metamorphoses.*

In sharp contrast Jupiter and Callisto's gender and physical appearance are virtually elided from the *Fasti*. I argue that the rape of Callisto in the *Fasti* is instead dominated by the oath of chastity made by Callisto to Diana and, consequently, the relationship between Diana and Callisto is important to this version. However, this thesis will argue that ultimately the vow is undercut by sexual innuendo turning what could have been a poignant examination of Callisto's lost friendship with Diana into a comedy.

Furthermore this thesis connects the comedy in the *Fasti* version of the rape of Callisto with the wider context of the *Fasti*. The rape of Callisto has not previously been considered part of the sexual comedy of the *Fasti*, but I shall argue that it is. Our exploration of sexual comedy as a theme of the *Fasti*, and the extension of this theme to include Callisto's rape, enhances this thesis' larger argument that the *Fasti*, as well as the *Metamorphoses*, is a text of flux.

In Chapter Three I turn to examine a not twice but thrice-told rape, the rape of Europa. I argue that, as a consequence of comparing a tale told twice in the *Metamorphoses* and once in the *Fasti*, we are able to distinguish a broad preference in the *Metamorphoses* for divine action, whilst the *Fasti* prefers to focus on the human angle. This also builds upon the conclusions of chapters one and two.

However we will still find that the *Metamorphoses* offers two different accounts of the myth; the first version emphasises Jupiter's disguise and its humorous consequences. The second *Metamorphoses* version also examines Jupiter's disguise but with the emphasis upon its deceit of Europa. I argue that, other than this emphasis on divine action, the rape of Europa has little in common with the rape of Callisto.

In addition I argue for an intratextual impetus between two *Metamorphoses* accounts. It is remarkable that both Ovid and Arachne tell the same story, and so

differently. In the first *Metamorphoses* version of Europa's rape Jupiter's bull is described as a work of art 'sed quae contendere possis/ facta manu' (*M*.2.855-6). He becomes that work of art, Arachne's textile art, later in the *Metamorphoses.*

The *Fasti* is quite different to both of the *Metamorphoses* versions of Europa's rape. There the emphasis is on Europa, rather than Jupiter, and, in common with the *Fasti*'s version of Callisto's rape, sexual innuendo is also employed. This thesis argues that the rape of Europa in the *Fasti*, like that of Callisto, is part of the thread of sexual comedy which runs through the *Fasti*.

Finally I argue that Ovid engages in a game of 'spot the difference' between the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* accounts of Europa's rape. Europa's hand positions are carefully described and carefully altered, offering the reader an invitation to compare and notice the difference.

In Chapter Four we turn from rape narratives to a story familiar from Greek tragedy: Hippolytus. We compare the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* accounts which both detail Hippolytus' exile, death and rebirth as Virbius. We see that again Ovid offers two quite different versions of the myth, including a quite remarkable first person narrative in the *Metamorphoses*. I argue that the Hippolytus of the *Metamorphoses* is deliberately characterised as unpleasant in order that the reader might enjoy the graphic description of his dismemberment. I further argue that the *Metamorphoses* demonstrates a continued interest in visually gruesome spectacles. Hippolytus' character in the *Fasti* is underdeveloped, instead the emphasis is upon Aesculapius and his healing craft. Divine action, as represented by Diana and the bull, will be argued to be much more prominent in the *Metamorphoses* version; the *Fasti*'s emphasis falls again on Aesculapius; the *Fasti* here engages with the theme of divine punishment.

In Chapter Five we focus on the remaining twice-told tales. There are several more twice-told tales told at some length in both texts: the apotheosis of Julius Caesar (*F*.3.697-710; *M*.15.745-870), Ino (*F*.6.473-550; *M*.4.416-562) and Tatius' Siege of Rome (*F*.1.259-276; *M*.14.775-804). I examine each of these episodes starting with the siege of Tatius, notable for its position as first twice-

told tale in the *Fasti*. I argue that here the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* set up an expectation of the difference between the remaining twice-told tales. Two key characteristics, that of increased interest in divine action in the *Metamorphoses* and an emphasis on violence and visual descriptions of violence in this same text, are found to be present in this twice-told tale. These distinctions, as we have seen throughout this thesis are roughly consistent throughout all of the twice-told tales. Therefore, I argue that this twice-told tale is programmatic of the relationship between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*.

We also consider how the difference between the two versions of Tatius' siege of Rome affect our understanding of the two texts and their relationship. We particularly question whether this calls into question the reliability of the Ovidian narrator in the *Metamorphoses*, or Janus in the *Fasti*, or both. We argue that the twice-told tales, by presenting such different versions of events, deliberately destabilise the reader's trust in the narrator.

This theme continues into our discussion of the apotheosis of Julius Caesar. There also we find different narrators giving quite different accounts of this event. Also we again see that the divine action is downgraded in the *Fasti*, the god which transports Caesar to heaven is Vesta in the *Fasti* rather than Venus in the *Metamorphoses*. We also trace, in the accounts of the siege of Tatius and the apotheosis of Julius Caesar in the *Fasti*, a general downplaying of the goddess Venus. I argue that this is important for the generic positioning of this text away from the goddess of amatory elegy.

In addition to surveying these tales we also look at the cluster of twice-told tales which occur in the last book of the *Fasti* (Hippolytus, Ino and Marsyas). Here we detect a theme of divine punishment in book six of the *Fasti* and discuss explanations for this theme. We also question why the *Fasti* ends with so many twice-told tales and argue that, just as the twice-told tales at the end of the *Metamorphoses* point forwards to the beginning of the *Fasti*, the twice-told tales in book six of the *Fasti* return us to the *Metamorphoses*.

In Chapter Six we turn from the comparison of twice-told tales to a twice-told discourse on animal sacrifice. Here this thesis argues that it is possible and useful to compare non-narrative episodes in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* when, as in this instance, there is strong similarity of theme and shared diction. We investigate the two texts' presentation of the different animal sacrifices and find a strong similarity in the order and presentation of these. We compare the two accounts of the Golden Age and argue that they are working structurally in tandem. We also note that the presentation of the gods and their involvement in animal sacrifice is one of the key differences between the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*.

We also survey one last example of the *Fasti*'s episodes of sexual comedy: the attempted rape of Lotis. Here we argue that this episode disrupts the tonal progression of the *Fasti*'s discourse on animal sacrifice, just as these episodes disrupt the tone of the *Fasti* more widely. Although the *Fasti*'s elegy is often destabilised through its association with epic, this is not the only direction from which comes a challenge to the *Fasti*'s elegy, lower genres also, such as mime and farce, are also shown to be an influence on this text.

Chapter One: Romulus' Apotheosis: Epic and Elegy

We move now from the introductory section to begin our close-readings of the twice-told tales, and begin with the apotheoses of Romulus. The only recent scholar to have engaged in a comparative study of both Ovid's versions of Romulus' apotheosis attests that a 'sense of multiple interpretive possibilities also pertains to Ovid's two accounts of the apotheosis of Romulus, where a comparative reading points up both echoes and differences' (Gosling 2002: 52).[25] This chapter will explore these interpretive possibilities whilst following the dominant approach of recent scholarship: comparing these two passages in terms of genre.

As explored in the introduction, previous scholarship has focused on the manner in which the *Fasti* strains under the weight of epic material. This is an especially important consideration for this chapter on the apotheoses of Romulus, for it brings great potential for generic disruption. After all, Romulus was an important Roman political[26] and historical figure.[27] According to Robinson, Ovid is self-

---

[25] Gosling goes on to say that 'The intention is probably not one of simple variation for variation's sake' (2002: 52). This thesis agrees broadly with this statement, acknowledging the prevalence of literary variation in the Latin canon, the necessity of varying the accounts between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti.* However the 'probably' is misplaced, as we will see the difference between the twice-told tales offers considerable insight into the two texts. Nor will this thesis engage with a fruitless attempt at discovering Ovid's intention behind his variations.

[26] There has been, in the last thirty years especially, a certain polarity in the interpretation of the *Fasti,* by the majority of critics, as regards the interpretation of the text's politics. This is documented by Robinson, who divides how scholars read the Augustan references in the *Fasti* into roughly two camps: the 'suspicious' and 'supportive' readers. The suspicious reader sees all praise of Augustus as not genuine, 'searching for troubling allusions, awkward juxtapositions and sinister intertexts', while the supportive reader thinks the praise of Augustus to be able to be taken at face value (Robinson 2010: vii). Although representing the widest part of scholarly thought on the *Fasti*, the supportive/suspicious dichotomy does not encompass all opinion. McKeown, for example argues that the *Fasti* itself has no political agenda; 'the *Fasti* as a whole was inspired primarily by the literary tradition, and not conceived as a eulogy of the emperor and his regime' (1984: 177). This suspicious/supportive dichotomy among critics has particular relevance to this thesis, as the extreme division of the critical interpretation may point to a certain ambivalence, or multiplicity of political representation in the *Fasti.* As this thesis seeks to demonstrate that the *Fasti* is a text characterised by flux, it will be argued that the apotheoses of Romulus highlight the political 'flux' in the *Fasti*. That is to say the *Fasti* isn't just a text that sits on the fence, it could be said to stand, as it were, alternatively on either side.

[27] Gosling notes the unusualness of Ovid reworking a historical narrative; he mostly reserves this treatment for mythological tales (2002: 52-3). Though as we will note below, a credible argument can be made that Ovid remythologises this narrative. All the remaining twice-told tales are, with one exception, mythological in character. The exception is the discourse on animal sacrifice, which may not be considered a twice-told tale, more a twice-told argument.

consciously aiming for epic tone in the *Fasti* and uses epic motifs that do not appear in the *Metamorphoses* (Robinson 2010: 203-204), as we shall see below.

We must also observe the position of these apotheoses within their wider texts. Romulus' apotheosis in the *Fasti* comes at a point of focus not only on Romulus[28] but also on generic tensions. The *Fasti* narrative occurs in book two, a book concerned more generally with genre. It opens with a proem that draws attention to generic concerns, 'nunc primum velis, elegi, maioribus itis:/ exiguum, memini, nuper eratis opus' (*F*.2.3-4). Shortly after follows a discussion of the impossible weight placed upon the elegiac metre (*F*.2.119-26) when recounting Augustus' receipt of the title *pater patriae* (*F*.2.133-144). The *Metamorphoses* version of Romulus' apotheosis occurs in the fourteenth book of the text. The apotheosis of Romulus is part of a larger trend in the last two books of the *Metamorphoses*; these two books are largely concerned with proto-Rome and the figures associated with the modern city's inception. There are some important implications from the positioning of this narrative, which we will survey later in this chapter.[29]

According to Heinze's theory we ought to be able to clearly distinguish the epic approach to Romulus' apotheosis in the *Metamorphoses* and contrast it to the elegiac version of the *Fasti*. As we shall see, and as the scholarly debate still raging bears witness, defining genre in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* is never simple; in the case of Romulus' apotheosis, genre is extremely unruly. The generic complication inherent in the *Fasti* arises, in simple terms, from the frequent inclusion in a poem of elegiac metre subject matter not normally found in texts of that metre. Ovid's metrical decision and its consequences have been widely covered by scholarship. Herbert Brown, to take one example, asserts that Ovid's choice of elegiac metre was an odd one for such an extensive work, elegy being 'more suited to poetry on a small scale' (Herbert-Brown 1994: 3). She cites

---

[28] In the *Fasti* Romulus is present throughout the text to a much greater degree than the *Metamorphoses*. In book two, the book featuring his apotheosis, we also find several other key Romulean passages. He is compared to Augustus (*F*.2.133-144); loses to the Quinctilii (*F*.2.365-380) and born (*F*.2.383-424).

[29] In addition, the structural implications of these placings, such that the end of the *Metamorphoses* foreshadows the beginning of the *Fasti*, will be the topic of the last chapter of this thesis.

Horace as describing that form should fit content (*Ars Poetica* 38-41) and Propertius that elegy was not suited for celebrating wars, gods, and men. (2.1.39-46) (Herbert-Brown 1994: 3).

In both Ovidian versions of Romulus' apotheosis (*M*.14.805-851; *F*.2.475-511) we find Romulus in front of a gathering of his people; Mars, looking down on the scene, reminds Jupiter of his promise that Romulus will be deified. Jupiter nods agreement and a storm descends on Romulus and the Quirites, under the cover of which Romulus is snatched up to heaven by Mars. Here, however, the narratives diverge.[30] In the *Fasti*, Julius Proculus encounters the shade of Romulus, now the god Quirinus, and receives instruction from him, which he relays to the Quirites. In the *Metamorphoses*, Romulus' grieving widow Hersilia, is visited by the goddess Iris and becomes the goddess Hora.

To understand these somewhat different endings it is useful to first examine the mythology of Romulus. The origins of the Romulus legend are obscure, as is the date when the Romulean legend began to incorporate the apotheosis. Quite when the myth transformed into the versions found in Ovid is unknown.[31] The deification of Romulus was certainly a familiar part of Roman literature; our earliest source is Ennius *Annales* fragment 1.10(Skutsch), 'Romulus in caelo cum

---

[30] Murgatroyd argues that, excluding the coda with Hersilia, the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* accounts end in a virtually identical place (2005: 243). This thesis however views the two accounts as forking directly after Romulus' apotheosis.

[31] It appears that different traditions of a Roman foundation myth may have begun, amongst the Greeks, in the 4th century BC. Carter (1909) points to examples of Roma in Hellanikos and Damastes of Sigeion, and Romos in Agothokles of Kyzikos (all found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.72) whilst Wiseman notes the variants Rhodius and Rhomylos in Alcimus (1995: 52). These different traditions offer several variations on the name Rome as the eponymous founder's name, thus confusing attempts to trace a linear history. It is also uncertain when the first references to Romulus and/or Remus appear. Carter suggests c.300 BC, in Kallias, recorded in Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.72., whereas Wiseman suggests that 'Rhodius,' appearing in the second half of the fourth century in the historian Alcimus, may be textual corruption of Rhomos (1995: 52). An interesting theory is that of Wiseman, as it may later help us to understand some of the stranger elements we will find in Ovid. Wiseman suggests that the Romulus and Remus story, from the foundation of Rome to Romulus' apotheosis, was created by the Romans through the medium of drama; he presupposes an active culture of mythological performance in Rome in the 4th Century BC (Wiseman 2004). We will return to the potential dramatic origins of myths in a later section (in particular the discussion of the Lotis and Priapus narrative in the animal sacrifice discourses chapter).

dis genitalibus aevum/ degit'. Closer to Ovid's time, Cicero (*De Re Publica* 2.10.17-19) and Livy (1.16.4) both give a version.[32]

There was also an alternative tradition, that rather than being deified Romulus was murdered. This was the other main explanation of Romulus' disappearance current in the first century BC.[33] As we shall see the *Fasti* but not the *Metamorphoses* version engages with this more rational explanation of Romulus' disappearance. Both Dionysius of Halicarnassus 2.56.3ff. and Livy 1.16.4 record that Romulus was murdered by citizens who hid his dismembered body under their togas. Dionysius of Halicarnassus seems to find this explanation 'more plausible' (*Ant. Rom.* 2.56.3) (Myers 2009: 201 n.805-28). We find something similar in Livy:

> Fuisse credo tum quoque aliquos qui discerptum regem patrum manibus taciti arguerent; manavit enim haec quoque sed perobscura fama; illam alteram admiratio viri et pavor praesens nobilitavit. Et consilio etiam unius hominis addita rei dicitur fides. (Livy 1.16.4-5)

Here we can see that Livy does not openly denounce the rational explanation of Romulus' death, but specifies that the story of Romulus' deification gained credence though the people's fear and their admiration for Romulus. Cicero in *De Re Publica* 2.10.17-19 does not offer this rational explanation. Instead he adheres to the view that Romulus' disappearance was caused by an apotheosis and remarks how wondrous that a man living so recently could become a god, in an era when it was not possible to invent fables (2.10.18). This could situate us in a Stoic view of the heavens, according to which good men were rewarded for their achievements. This comment could also be read as sarcastic, so although Cicero may not state the rational version openly he implies it.

---

[32] Skutsch also argues that Ennius' account included the figure of Proculus, indeed arguing that *Annales* 1.10Sk. was a line from Proculus' speech to the Quirites. However Skutsch's claim that the myth incorporated Proculus at this time is by no means certain (cf e.g. Jocelyn 1989: 42-46). Although as Robinson (2010: 205 n.476) notes, as little evidence of a Romulean cult survives it seems likely that his apotheosis was a late development. Even if we accept Skutsch's claim that Proculus was a part of Ennius' version of the Romulean myth, we find further questions arising from his precise name. Skutsch considers that the *praenomen* 'Julius' may have appeared as early as the second century BC but promotes the possibility that this Julian name was added to the myth of Romulus by Julius Caesar (1985: 260). This second explanation highlights important political resonances.

[33] There appear to have been other, more minor, traditions explaining Romulus' death. See Robinson (2010: 202 n.475-512) for further details.

The *Metamorphoses*, as already noted, has a very different ending to that of the *Fasti* and the Livian and Ciceronian versions of the myth. Rather than describe Proculus' encounter with Quirinus, (and the rational explanation for Romulus' death), the *Metamorphoses* instead recounts Hersilia's transformation into the goddess Hora. None of the surviving accounts of Romulus' apotheosis, other than the *Metamorphoses*, give an account of Hersilia's ascension and transformation to the goddess Hora. Although one quote from Ennius, 'teque Quirine pater veneror Horamque Quirini' 100Sk could be interpreted as evidence for the connection between Hersilia and Hora[34] it has been denied vigorously by Skutsch that Ennius linked the two.[35] Instead Skutsch contends that the transformation of Hersilia to Hora was an invention of Ovid's (Skutsch 1968: 132-7).[36]

If the origin of Hersilia's transformation to Hora is unknown, so is the identification of the deified Romulus as the god Quirinus. It is not clear when the deified Romulus became identified with Quirinus. Some have taken fragment 100Sk, 'teque Quirine pater ueneror Horamque Quirini' as evidence that the two were identified in Ennius (Anderson 1928: 31), but not all are convinced (Koch

---

[34] For an example of this argument see Anderson (1928: 31).

[35] Skutsch argues that Ennius refers not to Hora but rather to the feminine abstract noun.

[36] If Ovid did invent this myth, as Skutsch suggests, can we identify any myth elements he may have drawn from? Scholars are not quite in agreement as to the sources Ovid may have used although Wills attributes it to a mixture of the Greek myth of the ascension of Queen Berenice's hair and Roman sources on the apotheosis of Julius Caesar (Wills 1998: 288). However Myers argues for a greater predominance of Latin literature in the make up of this myth, citing the motif of burning hair as a marker of catasterism in Roman texts (Livy 1.39.1-2) (Myers 2009: 211 n.846-8). The link between Hersilia's ascension and this detail of burning hair further strengthen this passage's relation to the apotheosis of Julius Caesar in the *Metamorphoses*, 'flammiferumque trahens spatioso limite crinem/ stella micat' (*M*.15.8.49-50). Ovid certainly emphasises Hersilia's hair, 'ibi sidus ab aethere lapsum/ decidit in terras, a cuius lumine flagrans/ Hersilie crinis cum sidere cessit in auras' (*M*.14.846-848), lending weight to Wills' theory that queen Berenice's hair was amongst Ovid's source material. The myth of queen Berenice's hair (see Hyginus, *Astronomica* 2.24) was made well known by Catullus' adaptation of the Callimachean version (Catullus 66) (Knox 1986: 76). The introduction of Greek mythology into Romulus' apotheosis, which had been based on Roman historiography, effects a change in tone. The Graecising continues throughout the detail of this piece. Ovid chooses to call Hersilia by the Greek form of her name throughout this passage (see, for example, Hersilie in *M*.14.848). (However there is some debate about whether this was Ovidian intention or corruption from the manuscript tradition see Myers (2009: 209 n.830-1) for a greater exploration.) Another example of Ovid's Graecising tendencies towards Hersilia's name comes in line *M*.14.845 'cum virgine Thaumantea'. 'The Greek quadrisyllabic patronymic adjective (only here) creates a spondaic fifth foot, a Graecising metrical effect often associated with neoteric technique' (Myers 2009: 210 n.845-6). In *M*.14.848 Myers prefers the reading 'crines' to the more standard 'crinis' and notes this accusative of limitation with flagrans to be a poetic Graecism (2009: 211 n.847-8). Again the *Metamorphoses* text chooses to stress a Greek element of this new myth.

1960: 17ff.); (Skutsch 1968: 130-6). If Ennius did not equate Romulus and Quirinus, then the first attestation of their correlation dates from 63 BC[37] with the coins of Caius Memmius (Skutsch 1968: 130) and the account in Cicero's *De Republica* 2.10.20, dating to approximately 54-51BC (Carter 1909: 24).[38]

Having orientated this discussion with the tale's mythography, we now turn to begin our close reading and comparison of the two Ovidian versions of Romulus' apotheosis. In this context the presentation of Romulus proves a useful entry point. We find that there is little characterisation of Romulus in either text; the focus is upon the divine action or on the human reaction, as we will see below.[39] Skutsch presumes a catalogue of Romulus' achievements in Ennius (Skutsch 1985: 260-1).[40] If we turn to the *Metamorphoses*, we find no catalogue of Romulus' achievements. Instead the *Metamorphoses* removes the agency of Romulus in the development of Rome and impersonalises the statement of Rome's well-being to 'posita cum casside Mavors[41]/ talibus adfatur divumque hominumque parentem,/ "tempus adest, genitor, quoniam fundamine magno/ res Romana valet nec praeside pendet ab uno."' (*M*.14.806-8)[42] We will see regularly that Ennius was an important model for Ovid, which if Skutsch is right suggests that Ovid has deliberately omitted a particular focus on Romulus' military triumphs here, which we might expect as justification of the

---

[37] Although the precise date of this coin is not certain. Skutsch prefers 63 BC but offers 60 or 56 BC as alternatives (1968: 130).

[38] See Robinson (2010: 206 n.476) and Skutsch (1968: 130-136) for further on the debate on the identification of Romulus and Quirinus.

[39] If one looks outside of the apotheosis in both texts for characterisation of Romulus one finds a greater degree of development. In the *Fasti* the version of the Romulean myth spans his conception to deification and is split into nine separate narratives which lace through the *Fasti*. These tales are not arranged in chronological order, rather by calendar date. These different narratives each offer a slightly different perspective upon Romulus (Murgatroyd 2005: 147), which culminates in providing a much richer characterisation. See also Barchiesi (1997: 154-164) on the effect of the non-sequential tales of Romulus' life. As regards the *Metamorphoses*, there is one further reference to Romulus in this text, outside of his apotheosis, namely a brief reference to the story of Romulus' spear becoming a tree (M.15.560-564). There is also an invocation to Romulus as Quirinus (M.15.862-863). As well as being less characterised, Romulus is also less present throughout the *Metamorphoses* and much more present and somewhat more characterised in the *Fasti*.

[40] Heinze considered this lack of militarism to be indicative of the elegiac nature of the *Fasti* (1960: 338) not noting that it wasn't present in the *Metamorphoses* version either.

[41] We examine the generic implications of Mars' disarmament later in this chapter.

[42] Myers speculates that this line may well be another Ennian reference 'moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque' 156Sk, given the similarity of diction (2009: 203 n.808-9).

apotheosis.[43] In the context of the story more widely, the impersonality of this line is all the more surprising given the highly personal nature of Hersilia's grief, which follows in the *Metamorphoses* text.

What characterisation of Romulus there is appears primarily at the beginning of this version of the tale. The first words of the *Metamorphoses* account, 'occiderat Tatius' (*M*.14.805), when read in conjunction with the previous line (which declares Tatius and Romulus will share the throne) places the account temporally, although a 'suspicious' reader might see a hint that Romulus committed a political murder. This, however, is only a subtext to the less sinister interpretation of this phrase. Indeed Tatius' death (following a dispute over an attack his clansmen made on Lavinium) was retold in several sources, including Livy (1.14.1-3).[44]

The *Fasti*, on the other hand, doesn't hint at Tatius' potential murder.[45] There is, however, in the *Fasti* the briefest of mentions of Romulus' achievements, 'nam pater armipotens, postquam nova moenia vidit/ multaque Romulea bella peracta manu' (2.481-82).[46] This is more than allowed by the *Metamorphoses* and it returns to Romulus the agency for his actions.

Romulus' presentation is somewhat further illustrated if one examines Romulus' position at the point of his apotheosis in the *Fasti*. Interestingly Ovid's *Fasti* is the first source we possess which situates Romulus' apotheosis in an environment of civil law. Prior to Ovid a more military setting is preferred, Livy has Romulus observing troops on the Campus Martius, (1.16). Dionysius depicts

---

[43] Gosling is concerned that this lack of praise raises doubt as to whether Romulus (and potentially the Augustan regime given their close relation) is endorsed in this text (2002: 63).

[44] However, as we will note later in this chapter, the fratricidal murder of Remus is also hinted at in this text, reminding us of another person who died after sharing power with Romulus.

[45] The *Fasti*'s apotheosis of Romulus begins instead with an Ovidian opening formula 'proxima lux' (*F*.2.475), also used at *Fasti* 1.637 to begin another Roman foundation myth. Then the first line continues to position this day in the calendar, and explain the gap between the last entry and this, 'at tertia dicta Quirino' (*F*.2.475). Where the *Fasti* positions the account within the days of the year, the *Metamorphoses* positions Romulus in the scheme of rulers. The different timescales with which the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* open, the *Fasti* days, the *Metamorphoses* years, reflect upon the two texts' different scales, and in doing so the *Metamorphoses* opens by characterising Romulus whereas the *Fasti* sticks to the restraints of its calendrical form.

[46] This description comes after the opening etymologies for 'Quirinus'. Robinson describes this change from the etymology to the main thrust of the story as a move 'up to an epic register' (2010: 202 n.475-512).

Romulus addressing troops at a camp (2.56.2) (Gosling 2002: 61).[47] We can view this generically as an indication that Ovid wishes to play down Romulus' militarism, most strikingly perhaps in the *Fasti* as this is the text that stresses his law giving. Or we may consider, as Gosling does (Gosling 2002: 63), that Romulus' martial aspect is developed with this presentation as a peacetime ruler.[48]

Although Romulus is little characterised, the god Mars has already entered the narrative, in some style. Mars is given the epithet 'armipotens', a title that highlights his militarism (and that of the text) and also has a good epic pedigree; it is used by Virgil, and in conjunction with 'pater' recalls the council of the gods (10.100) (Robinson 2010: 208 n.481).[49] In addition when Mars looks down at Romulus he sees the wars waged by Romulus, as opposed to the great future of Rome in the *Metamorphoses*. Already we begin to see that the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* have a complicated generic relationship, with the *Fasti* potentially providing the more 'epic' version, in this instance.

The comparison of Romulus' presentation in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*, seems to lead us into a comparison of Mars, together with the *arma* with which he is associated. Indeed, *arma* is a prototypically epic element, and was one of the elements Hinds found in his 1987 study to be distinguished between the rapes of Persephone. However implementing a simple '*arma* equals epic' equation in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* is not necessarily a safe or desirable choice, as we shall see. In a paradigmatic epic one would expect considerable emphasis on arms and warfare. *Arma* and epic became an inescapable partnership in Virgil's *Aeneid*, when the word 'arms' opened the narrative (Barchiesi 1997: 17). The *Fasti*, a metrically elegiac text, ought, in theory, to limit its engagement with

---

[47] Gosling compares Ovid's two versions with that of Cicero *Republica*. Cicero's protagonist Scipio gives considerable justification for Romulus' deification (2.4-2.20), whereas Ovid offers little justification. Gosling attributes this, in the *Fasti*, to the lightness of the elegiac metre making expressions of admiration inappropriate (and likely to sound ironic). However she also considers that this creates a Romulus 'so inconsistent with the tradition' as to be scarcely believable (2002: 63). Certainly the justification for Romulus' apotheosis is primarily familial in both texts, he is Mars' son.

[48] Gosling interprets this difference in location as an Ovidian argument that the arts of war must be balanced with those of peace (2002: 61).

[49] See Robinson, (loc. cit.) for further pre-Ovidian uses of this word.

arma.[50] Some scholars believe the *Fasti* does this: Barchiesi, for example, has
characterised the *Fasti* as a text that removes *arma* wherever possible, 'the *Fasti*
is the Augustan poem that dissociates itself most completely from *arma* and
accounts for this dissociation and dislike most exhaustively' (Barchiesi 1997: 17-
18).[51] However, in parts of the *Fasti* (for example in book five (545-598) when
Ovid describes the reasons behind Augustus building the temple to Mars Ultor)
the *Fasti* does engage with military themes at some length. We already have
some indication, from examining the presentation of Romulus, that the *Fasti*, will
at this point not entirely avoid an engagement with *arma*. We now examine the
presentation of Mars,[52] and the extent to which he incorporates *arma* into the two
narratives.

Mars' speech is a key part of both narratives and receives eight lines in the
Metamorphoses (*M*.14.808-815)[53] and five lines in the *Fasti* (*F*.2.483-487). The
speeches share a strong similarity of purpose (persuading Jupiter to allow the
apotheosis of Romulus) and even contain one identical line (most likely an
Ennian quote, further on which below). The two Ovidian apotheoses of Romulus
share not only a (mostly) similar plot, but also a speech made by the same god,
quoting the same line. This is an extremely strong invitation to compare the two
accounts, to see the different nuance of the speech, the different characterisation
of Mars, how the concern of the speech is different and how the generic
implication of the speech is different.

First let us briefly examine how Ovid sets the scene for these two speeches. The
Metamorphoses narrative jumps almost headlong into Mars' speech:

---

[50] Ovid already had a history of playing with the generic boundaries associated with *arma*. He
had previously opened the first book of the *Amores* with the word *arma* (Barchiesi 1997: 18).
[51] Although Barchiesi later acknowledges that the *Fasti* does use epic material and techniques to
confuse the reader as to the genre of the *Fasti* (1997: 23).
[52] Hinds 1992 discusses Mars' characterisation in the *Fasti* as a whole (1992: esp. 89-90, 98-104,
109-110). Hinds finds Mars' epic tendencies to be somewhat but not fully mitigated in the *Fasti*.
Hinds makes particular note that Mars' book, the third book of the *Fasti*, contains a 'mini *Aeneid*'
and a reference to Rhea Silvia, which Hinds argues to have been drawn from the Ennian account
of this myth, the most famous version prior to Ovid (1992: 108-9). As can be seen from these
examples Hinds interprets the figure of Mars in generic terms, and argues that Ovid presents a
complicated picture of Mars and epic generally in the *Fasti*.
[53] Romulus' apotheosis is part of a larger theme in the *Metamorphoses*, which sees Hercules
(9.239-61); Aeneas (14.585-608); and Caesar (15.760-842) apotheosised by divine interference
and after divine speech (Myers 2009: 202 n.805-17).

> Occiderat Tatius, populisque aequata duobus,
> Romule, iura dabas: posita cum casside Mavors
> talibus adfatur divumque hominumque parentem:
> 'tempus adest, genitor, quoniam fundamine magno
> res Romana valet nec praeside pendet ab uno,
> praemia, (sunt promissa mihi dignoque nepoti)
> solvere et ablatum terris inponere caelo.
> tu mihi concilio quondam praesente deorum
> (nam memoro memorique animo pia verba notavi)
> "unus erit, quem tu tolles in caerula caeli"
> dixisti: rata sit verborum summa tuorum!' (*M*.14.805-15)

As we can see from the above, there is just one and a half lines of scene setting for the myth as a whole (on Tatius' fall and Romulus becoming sole ruler) before another line and a half prelude to the speech itself, 'posita cum casside Mavors/ talibus adfatur divumque hominumque parentem' (*M*.14.806-7) (we will return to the first line of this description). The description of Jupiter as the Father of gods and men is firmly in the grand tone of epic. It is similar to Jupiter's description by Juno at *Aeneid* 1.65, which relates Jupiter's delegation of minor powers.

We find that the *Fasti* version takes longer to get to Mars' speech; it first spends six lines looking at the etymology of Quirinus. After the etymologies follows a couplet to set the scene for Mars' speech 'nam pater armipotens, postquam nova moenia vidit/ multaque Romulea bella peracta manu' (*F*.2.481-2). There is no description of Jupiter here; instead the focus stays upon Mars and his actions. We have already noted the emphasis on warfare in these lines.

If we focus for a moment on the *Metamorphoses*, the Mars of this text emphasises the fated nature of the apotheosis from his opening words 'tempus adest' (*M*.14.808). He also uses the term 'promissa' (*M*.14.810) which is repeated during the apotheosis (*M*.14.818). This Mars also refers to the council of the gods, 'tu mihi concilio quondam praesente deorum' (*M*.14.812), which most likely evokes a scene in Ennius' *Annales*.[54] The Ennian theme is continued with a direct quote from the *Annales* 'unus erit, quem tu tolles in caerula caeli'

---

[54] For a more detailed analysis of the Ennian intertexts see Myers (2009: 202-211).

(*M*.14.814) (Feeney 1984: 186)[55] (also used in the *Fasti* but to different effect, which we will explore below). This direct quote, as Barchiesi notes, leads to the amusing result that Mars is quoting mythological epic for credibility, that he has memorised a text dedicated to himself (Barchiesi 1997: 115).[56]

The *Fasti* could adopt the same tactic as the *Metamorphoses* and focus upon the fated nature of the apotheosis and the Ovidian fulfilment of the Ennian prophecy. However, despite the strong similarity between the two Ovidian versions of Mars' speech,[57] the *Fasti* text places the emphasis of this quote in quite a different context. The fated element of Romulus' apotheosis, so stressed in Mars' speech in the *Metamorphoses*, does not enter into the *Fasti*; no word cognate with *promitto* is used. Instead the implications of 'unus' are brought to the fore. Already undoubtedly emphatic in the first-word position (in both texts) Skutsch argues that this emphasis on 'unus' implies the Ennian version included some mention of the other brother, Remus in contrast (Skutsch 1985: 205). And here the *Fasti* is true to its Ennian original: Mars names Remus in the line prior (*F*.2.485-487) and this casts a spotlight on the 'unus' in the next line (*F*.2.487).[58] 'Unus' develops, in the *Fasti,* an emphasis on Mars' familial relations. Mars gives, as argument for Romulus' apotheosis, his filial relationship with Mars, 'redde patri natum' (*F*.2.485). Another reference to their father/son relationship occurs in Mars' speech;[59] the emphatic first-word position of 'sanguinis' (*F*.2.484). This is in sharp distinction to the *Metamorphoses*, where the kin relationship is compressed to simply 'dignoque nepoti' (*M*.14.810).

---

[55] Mars' quote is also quoted by Varro, in *Lingua Latina* 7.2f. as an example of poetic diction and therefore pre-dates both the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* (Feeney 1984: 185f.). By having Mars quote Ennius Ovid adds authenticity to his accounts of the divine action and, as ever, constructs a learned narrator's voice aware of the previous versions of this myth (Myers 2009: 204 n.812-15). Hinds constitutes this as Mars' signalling the Ennian account as a memory (Hinds 1998: 15).
[56] This is similar in its somewhat comical effect to Apollo's hymn of praise to himself, when chasing the nymph Daphne (*M*.1.514-524). This is useful in characterising Mars (as, perhaps, slightly self-important). Mars is also revealing an interest in poetry, hitherto undiscovered (Robinson 2010: 209 n.487).
[57] Robinson (2010: 208 n.483-8) also notes the similarity, and cites Remus as the only major difference between the two speeches.
[58] We will return to further investigate Remus later in this chapter.
[59] Hinds notes the close association in the *Fasti* between Romulus and his father Mars (1992: 117).

From a generic standpoint these Ennian intertexts are part of the 'stylistically elevated' moments, which Myers notes in the *Metamorphoses* (2009: 202 n.805-17). The combination of Mars' emphasis on the fated nature of the apotheosis and the intertextual links with the Ennian epic history of this narrative combine in the *Metamorphoses* to create the illusion that this version of Romulus' apotheosis (the *Metamorphoses*') is the one prophesised in the Ennian text. The *Metamorphoses*' apotheosis is the fulfilment of the early epic's, placing the *Metamorphoses* in a tradition of epic texts. And yet, with this line the *Fasti* is also brought, at least to some degree, into this tradition. The *Fasti* is an elegy, which, at moments such as this, seems to aspire beyond the ordinary limitations of its genre.

The verbal echoes between the two versions of Mars' speech are not limited to this one quote from Ennius. Gosling has neatly summarised them: '*F*.2.483, 'habet Romana potentia vires', parallels *M*.14.808-9 'fundamine magno/ res Romana valet'. The words 'tu mihi dixisti' (*F*.2.488) are found framing *M*.14.812-15. *F*. 2.488, 'sint rata dicta Iovis', echoes *M*.14.815, 'rata sit verborum summa tuorum'. Gosling reads these similarities in diction as pointing towards the importance of the divine element in the story (Gosling 2002: 55). Indeed we will continue to see the importance of divine action to the *Metamorphoses* account.

In the *Fasti*, Jupiter's nod is a slow-acting catalyst, the narrative pauses again after his nod to set the scene (*F*.2.491-495).[60] When the *Fasti* arrives at the apotheosis, Mars' divine action is compressed into only one line 'fit fuga,[61] rex patriis astra petebat equis' (*F*.2.496) and Romulus remains the subject. In the *Metamorphoses*, however, we find a detailed and vivid description of Mars before and during his descent to earth. The description of Mars, before his

---

[60] This scene setting is very important and we will return to it after our consideration of Mars' descent to earth in the *Metamorphoses*.

[61] Gosling argues that the very brevity of Mars' descent draws attention to it. '[Ovid] will also, in Alexandrian fashion, allude cryptically to a significant point. "Fit fuga" is just such a point (and it is further emphasised by the metrical isolation imposed by the unusual pause coinciding with the end of the first foot' (2002: 56). Although Gosling does not make this argument, one could argue that the brevity of Mars' flight calls attention not only to the flight but also to the more extended description of this in the *Metamorphoses* version.

descent to earth in the *Metamorphoses*, highlights his weaponry and chariot, 'quae sibi promissae sensit rata signa rapinae,/ innixusque hastae pressos temone cruento/ inpavidus conscendit equos Gradivus et ictu/ verberis increpuit' (*M*.14.818-821). Already we, the reader, begin to get an indication that the *Metamorphoses* will give an impressive and magisterial account of the apotheosis.

The *Metamorphoses* has a description, some eleven lines in length (*M*.14.818-828) of Mars' descent to earth, and of Romulus' metamorphosis. This is related in a single period, the longest of either of the two accounts; it has a high degree of parataxis, which adds speed to the narrative and heightens the dramatic tension. Phrases such as 'temone cruento' and 'ictu verberis' (*M*.14.819-821) add a strong sense of violence to Mars' descent. This account focuses upon the divine action of Mars, and the violence of the descent to earth reflects upon Mars' characterisation, as a grand and warlike god:

> quae sibi promissae sensit rata signa rapinae,
> innixusque hastae pressos temone cruento
> inpavidus conscendit equos Gradivus et ictu
> verberis increpuit pronusque per aera lapsus
> constitit in summo nemorosi colle Palati
> reddentemque suo iam regia iura Quiriti
> abstulit Iliaden: corpus mortale per auras
> dilapsum tenues, ceu lata plumbea funda
> missa solet medio glans intabescere caelo;
> pulchra subit facies et pulvinaribus altis
> dignior, est qualis trabeati forma Quirini. (*M*.14.818-828)

This thesis would also argue that Mars of the *Metamorphoses* is characterised, tangentially through the action of the apotheosis; although this is not specifically describing Mars, it is a description of his action. For example, when Mars snatches Romulus an extended simile of weaponry, the flight of lead bullets, is used to describe Romulus' ascent, 'corpus mortale per auras/ dilapsum tenues, ceu lata plumbea funda/ missa solet medio glans intabescere caelo' (*M*.14.824-826). Mars' military aspects are expressed in the imagery of the simile.[62] The

---

[62] This simile may also be considered to strike a strangely scientific, Lucretian tone at a moment of supernatural activity (see Lucretius on lightning *DRN* 6.177-9). Myers notes that Ovid often

picture of Mars and his chariot carrying Romulus up to heaven is also considered by Skutsch to be a scene modelled on that of Ennius (1985: 260). The Ennian flavour of the *Metamorphoses* adds further to the epic associations of this passage.

If the *Fasti* apotheosis focuses less upon the divine action of Mars, what does it focus upon? The *Fasti* pauses briefly after Jupiter's nod and shifts the perspective of the apotheosis entirely. The location of Romulus' apotheosis in the *Fasti* is named as the Goat Marsh, 'est locus, antiqui Capreae dixere paludem' (*F*.2.491). This was the traditional setting for those accounts that narrated Romulus' apotheosis (rather than his dismemberment) (Robinson 2010: 202 n.475-512). We also find this location given in Livy's account, 'cum ad exercitum recensendum contionem in campo ad Caprae paludem haberet' (Livy 1.16.1). In the *Metamorphoses* the location of Romulus is not given. Instead Mars descends 'in summo nemorosi colle Palati' (*M*.14.822), therefore the *Metamorphoses* focuses upon the position of the god, rather than the man. Here the *Fasti* focuses on the man.

In the Goat Marsh Romulus is dispensing laws to his assembled Quirites, 'forte tuis illic, Romule, iura dabas' (*F*.2.492). Suddenly the weather changes, 'sol fugit, et removent subeuntia nubila caelum,/ et gravis effusis decidit imber aquis./ hinc tonat, hinc missis abrumpitur ignibus aether' (*F*.2.493-5). We see the sudden dark (a possible eclipse), rain and thunder more from the perspective of the human beings in the audience. In fact, one might well argue that Ovid devotes more space to the weather phenomena in the *Fasti* precisely so the reader will identifying with the crowd of Quirites, and will share their terror at these meteorological omens. This also explains why the *Fasti* places the assembly scene in the middle of the narrative, rather than at the beginning as in the *Metamorphoses*. Ovid has saved this set piece to create a much more vivid

---

applies Lucretian descriptions of meterological phenomena to his metamorphoses (*M*.3.487-90, 4.121-4, 9.219-25) (Myers 2009: 207 n.824-6).

picture of the human perspective and circumstances of the apotheosis.[63] In addition the detail of 'sol fugit' may indicate an eclipse of the sun, an ominous solar event not mentioned in the *Metamorphoses*, which gives the sudden darkness an even more terrifying edge.[64] However, the *Fasti* is not necessarily positioning itself on a lesser generic level than the *Metamorphoses*. Although the *Fasti* does not have the same epic set piece as the *Metamorphoses* with Mars' descent to earth and focuses upon the human rather than divine action, scholars see this storm as an epic storm (Robinson 2010: 232 n.493).

If we also consider the language of the *Fasti*'s apotheosis closely we may find further epic flavour; lines 494-497 are heightened by rhyme at the end of the clauses:

> sol fugit, et removent subeuntia nubila caelum,
> > et gravis effusis decidit imber aquis.
> hinc tonat, hinc missis abrumpitur ignibus aether:
> > fit fuga, rex patriis astra petebat equis.
> luctus erat, falsaeque patres in crimine caedis. (*F*.2.493-497)

The three rhyming words, *aquis, equis* and *caedis* cover the apotheosis and the suspected guilt of the senators (which we will be looking at later in this section); and their patterning is particularly interesting. In his study of rhyme in Classical Latin authors, Clarke argues that rhyme was employed to emphasise the beginnings and endings of clauses (as here in the *Fasti*), to illustrate sense pauses and to provide extra poetic decoration to important passages (Clarke 1972: 49-77 esp.55). However the use of three rhyming verse line endings is identified by Clarke as the most prevalent rhyme scheme in both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Aeneid* (Clarke 1972: 60); it is not a normal rhyme pattern for an elegiac text.[65] The *Fasti* continues to defy elegiac norms by using a rhyme scheme more usually associated with epic poetry and, in so doing, introducing an epic flavour to Romulus' apotheosis, despite its brevity.

---

[63] Although it is important to note that the storm was central to this version of the myth (in particular see Livy 1.16.1, see Robinson for further references (2010: 212 n.493)).

[64] For a discussion of the probability that this line refers to an eclipse see Robinson (2010: 212 n.499).

[65] Clarke defines typical elegiac rhyme as occurring at the end of each line of verse, caused by the separation of a noun and its adjective, the inflection causing them to rhyme (Clarke 1972: 62), which is manifestly not the case here.

Now we have surveyed the majority of Mars' actions in this apotheosis (one more crucial action remains to which we return shortly), it is now time to survey that other god, Jupiter. We skirted around a discussion of Jupiter's nod above, let us return to discuss this divine action. Directly after Mars' speech in the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* is Jupiter's nod of assent,[66] 'Iuppiter adnuerat. Nutu tremefactus uterque/ est polus' (*F*.2.489-90). Ovid also uses a similar phrase in the *Metamorphoses*, 'adnuit omnipotens et nubibus aera caecis/ occuluit tonitruque et fulgure terruit orbem' (*M*.14.816-7). Jupiter's nod is one of his characteristic actions; we find, for example, Jupiter's nod described with considerable majesty by Homer (*Iliad* 1.528-530). Jupiter's nod appears first in the Latin canon in Catullus 64.204 in the story of Ariadne and Theseus.[67] So Jupiter's nod is an important epic moment in both the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses*. The *Fasti* also makes clear its epic pedigree with a closely echoed intertext[68] with Virgil's *Aeneid*: 'adnuit, et totum nutu tremefecit Olympum' (*Aeneid* 9.106).[69] Some critics also argue that it is the *Fasti* that gives this epic motif greater prominence (Robinson 2010: 209 n.489). The *Fasti* again positions itself in a tradition of epic texts, and uses motifs and language one could expect from an epic text.

So can we conclude that both the texts present what might be considered an epic version of Romulus' apotheosis? Unfortunately not, there is an important element of the presentation of *arma* in the *Metamorphoses* that we have yet to investigate, and one that may have an impact on our understanding of both texts. In the *Metamorphoses*, at the opening of the account, before Mars approaches Jupiter to beg for Romulus' apotheosis Mars lays aside his weapons, 'posita cum casside Mavors/ talibus adfatur divumque hominumque parentem' (*M*.14.806-7). This is fundamentally important to our understanding of the generic position of the apotheosis of Romulus in the *Metamorphoses* (and possibly, by extension,

---

[66] Myers notes that the weather signs associated here with Jupiter's nod are traditional (2009: 205 n.816-17).

[67] Robinson explores the literary history of Jupiter's nod in greater depth (2010: 209 n.489).

[68] The *Metamorphoses* also could be thought to engage with this intertext but the epic precedent is more prominent in the *Fasti*.

[69] Gosling notes that Jupiter's *Fasti* nod is formed of a poetic allusion to Atlas (2002: 55). This poetic language again heightens the grandeur of Jupiter's *Fasti* nod.

the generic position of the *Fasti*'s account too). The description of Jupiter as the Father of gods and men is a phrase of epic pedigree as we noted above. However Mars' laying aside of weapons has quite different generic implications. To understand the full implication of this phrase we must also note that Ovid uses the trope of Mars removing his armour elsewhere in his *oeuvre*, twice in the *Fasti*. The first is the couplet which opens book three of the *Fasti*: 'Bellice, depositis clipeo paulisper et hasta,/ Mars, ades et nitidas casside solve comas' (*F*.3.1-2). The couplet that opens book three of the *Fasti*, the removal of Mars' helmet, coupled with the description of Mars' hair (3.17), is typically viewed by scholars as a symbol of his entrance into elegy.[70] The second instance in the *Fasti* of Mars removing his weapons makes our understanding of the *Metamorphoses* more complicated, as there is a strong intertextual link: 'sic ego. sic posita dixit mihi casside Mavors/ (sed tamen in dextra missilis hasta fuit)' (*F*.3.171-2). Here we can see the link between the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* sharpened by the use of similar and identical diction (compare the *Fasti* quote with 'posita...casside' (*M*.14.806)). We also have Mars named by the same name 'Mavors' in the same metrical position, in both versions. Barchiesi reads this in generic terms, seeing Mars' removal of his weapons in the *Fasti* as a generic comment on the part of Ovid, 'If [Mars] wants to find a place in the *Fasti* he must disarm, and thus abandon the field of heroic epic' (Barchiesi 1997: 62).

A motif that occurs twice in the *Fasti* (and nowhere else in his *oeuvre*) here appears in the *Metamorphoses*. In a supposedly epic text, there is also no need for Mars to disarm to enter the text. Why then do we find this disarmament in the *Metamorphoses*? Are we supposed to view Mars as entering into an elegiac mode in the *Metamorphoses* when he removes his helmet? Or does this indicate that Romulus' apotheosis in the *Metamorphoses* should be read as a quasi-elegiac narrative? Neither of these explanations, however, can incorporate the violent, godly action with which Mars undertakes the apotheosis, which we explored above. Myers explains Mars' disarming here in the *Metamorphoses* as 'a

---

[70] Hinds (1992) is important here. He analyses the laying aside of Mars' weapons in book three of the *Fasti*, (1992: esp. 88-90) and notes that Jupiter is also portrayed without his arms in this book (*F*.3.3.440) (Hinds 1992: 93-4). Book three of the *Fasti* is clearly very concerned with issues of being armed or disarmed. Hinds understands this theme on a generic level, that the war god Mars must disarm to enter elegiac fiction (1992: 88-90).

humorous detail and conciliatory gesture'. She also relates this to the version of this line in the *Fasti*, and attributes both to a context of peace (Myers 2009: 203 n.806-7). Perhaps Mars' awkward disrobing in the *Metamorphoses* can be read as humorous, but this fails to explain the generic angle.

This thesis would suggest that although the *Metamorphoses* sows a violent, warlike seam in its account, it problematises this by describing Mars removing his helmet in language reminiscent of the *Fasti*. In doing so it destabilises its generic position, not only because it is an epic text that references an elegiac text's dismissal of epic themes, but also because there is an elegiac version of the apotheosis of Romulus, with which one can easily compare. The effects of such destabilisation of generic position are manifold but one effect may be to increase the ease and likelihood of us reading intertextually between the versions of Romulus' apotheosis in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*.

The generic complication we have seen in the unexpected removal of *arma* by Mars in the *Metamorphoses* is compounded by the unexpected presence of lamentation, a feature often associated with the elegiac genre.[71] In 1987 Hinds argued that the rape of Persephone in the *Fasti* was marked by a preponderance of references to lamentation, particularly when compared to the *Metamorphoses*' own lack of emphasis on lamentation (1987: 105). The end of the *Metamorphoses* version of Romulus' apotheosis, (quite different to that of the *Fasti* which we examine below), examines the grief and ascension of Hersilia, Romulus' widow.

The decision to recount Hersilia's widowhood in the *Metamorphoses* and employ diction such as 'flebat' (*M*.14.829) and 'fletus' (*M*.14.835) seems to unsteady our understanding of the generic relationship between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*. By contrast to the unexpectedly lachrymose *Metamorphoses*, grief in the *Fasti* is proscribed against. The ghost of Romulus instructs Julius Proculus, 'prohibe lugere Quirites,/ nec violent lacrimis numina nostra suis' (*F*.2.505-506); this follows a narratorial remark upon the grief of the people, 'luctus erat'

---

[71] Hinds argues for the close association between elegiac poetry and mourning for the dead (1987: 103).

(*F*.2.497).[72] Here the focus is upon the general grief of Romulus' people, the Quirites, rather than Hersilia's personal grieving and as such it is less emotive. The grief of the Roman people is also a traditional and necessary element of this story: their grief at the loss of Romulus was a potential threat to the senators, who were suspected of his murder: a threat that was allayed by Julius Proculus' vision. Perhaps we might consider that the removal of Mars' helmet in the *Metamorphoses* in some way prepares us for Hersilia's (potentially more elegiac) grief later in the same text.

Alternatively we may wish to re-examine lamentation as a marker of generic boundary. Lamentation at death, despite it strong association with elegy (and Hinds' arguments to that effect (1987: 103-106)) is not exclusively confined to that genre. Homer's epics contained plenty of weeping widows.[73] However the definition of epic may have considerably altered by the time of Ovid's contemporary Rome, and weeping widows may have been more closely associated with elegy than they were in Homeric times. However in Virgil's *Aeneid* there are also examples of grieving women; Dido for example weeps copiously at the loss of Aeneas, 'lacrimae volvuntur inanes' (4.449).

Hersilia is also part of a network of grieving widows in the latter part of the *Metamorphoses;* Canens 14.416-34 and Egeria 15.485-551. However it is interesting that two of these weeping widows Hersilia and Egeria[74] both have a *Fasti* companion piece in which they do not feature. The *Metamorphoses* may draw on an epic tradition for weeping widows, but by putting them into contrast with the *Fasti* version it problematises our understanding of them.

---

[72] The reaction of the Quirites to the disappearance of Romulus also varies in the different sources. Plutarch records a general joy and worship of Romulus (*Rom*.27.8); Livy, however, has the Quirites sorrowful after the departure of their king, and uses a simile of parentless children (1.16.2). Cicero attributes the deification of Romulus to a general feeling of respect for Romulus (*De rep*. 2.10.17). Ovid, in the *Fasti*, follows the Livian mode with the Quirites mourning (*F*.2.497). 'luctus erat' (*F*.2.497) is a simple statement and shows Ovid less interested in the psychological aspects of the myth, which interested Livy.

[73] Hecuba, Andromache and all the Trojan women weep at Hector's death *Iliad* 22.405-515. Penelope, the supposedly bereaved wife of Odysseus, weeps often in the Odyssey, one example is 19.541-543.

[74] Egeria, as we will see, also features in another twice-told tale, the death of Hippolytus.

Perhaps rather than using a simple elegiac/epic opposition we might add a further genre to the equation, tragedy. Tragedy, with its own frequent lamentation, is also often placed in opposition to elegy. Ovid himself describes this opposition in his *Amores* 3.1 when he personifies the two in quite distinct styles (Tragedy as worthy and pompous, Elegy as mischievous and fun) and has them fight over him. Perhaps Hersilia's grief may be better understood as the *Metamorphoses* engaging with tragedy rather than borrowing lamentation from elegy. Attic tragedy is brimming with lamenting women, for example: Electra in *The Libation Bearers*, Medea lamenting the loss (not actual death) of her husband, and children. *The Trojan Women*, is a play which centres around women grieving for their dead husbands. Indeed scholars define one of the primary functions of women in Greek drama as lamentation.[75] Therefore the *Metamorphoses* may be seen as incorporating a tragic tone through intertexts with tragedy.

Hersilia, as well as being part of a network of grieving women in the *Metamorphoses*, is part of a closural pattern of catasterism and apotheoses. Myers notes the similarity of the Hersilia metamorphosis and catasterism to that of Julius Caesar and Augustus at the end of book fifteen (Myers 2009: 208 n.829-51).[76] Boyle also speculates that Hersilia's starry apotheosis foreshadows that of Julius Caesar (2003: 249).[77]

We've examined the ending of the *Metamorphoses* now let us turn to compare how the *Fasti* ends the apotheosis of Romulus: Julius Proculus' encounter with Quirinus. First it is interesting to note, as Murgatroyd does, that the ascension of Hersilia is full of intertextual links to the *Fasti* account of Julius Proculus' encounter with Quirinus. For example, there is an intertext between Quirinus instructing Julius Proculus to tell the Quirites not to mourn (*F.*2.505-6) and Iris instructing Hersilia not to mourn (*M.*14.835) (Murgatroyd 2005: 244). Therefore, although the two texts relate a different ending to Romulus' apotheosis, we are still invited to take an intertextual reading of these two texts. This ties Hersilia's

---

[75] See particularly Foley (2001).

[76] It is Myers' suggestion that Hersilia may symbolise Augustus' wife Livia, as an exemplary matron (2009: n.829-51).

[77] There does not appear to be any particular link made between Caesar and Hersilia other than both engaging in this theme of the catasterism of important Roman figures.

apotheosis more closely to the traditional ending of the text. It may possibly also bring to the *Fasti* some of the more fabulous tone of the *Metamorphoses*. As we shall see the ending of Romulus' apotheosis in the *Fasti* engages in a process of remythologisation, and possibly the intertexts with Hersilia's ascension may help set the tone for this process.

The meeting of Proculus and Quirinus is the traditional ending of this myth, which we find in Livy (1.16.5-8), Plutarch (*Rom.* 28) and Dionysius (2.56.2-6). Although Ovid's choice of ending in the *Fasti* is more in keeping with the Livian tradition, we immediately see that Ovid's interpretation of the Julius Proculus episode varies from this potential source material. In Livy's account Proculus addresses an assembly and relates his encounter with Romulus in a first-person account and Livy focuses entirely upon the future military might of Rome (1.16.7-8).[78] Livy also may be thought to express hesitancy about the veracity of Proculus' statement, 'Et consilio etiam unius hominis addita rei dicitur fides' (1.16.5).[79] There is also little in the way of clear intertextual echoes between Ovid's account and Livy's (Gosling 2002: 59). An extract from Livy's version of Proculus' speech reveals a slight verbal echo between the two 'proinde rem militarem colant sciantque' (1.16.7) (Gosling 2002: 60).[80] But despite the lack of obvious intertexts it is useful to compare the two.[81]

Ovid's account is much more dramatic. The account is told in the third person, which adds credence to the story and is told, as it were, while it is happening using the imperfect tense, which does not give the sense of completed action that the Livian account does. Where Livy focuses upon Julius Proculus' mental state at such an apparition 'cum perfusus horrore venerabundus adstitissem' (1.16.6), Ovid instead describes the physical manifestation of the terror of Proculus,

---

[78] Penella (1990) discusses the particular focus on *opes*, a word not used in Ovid's account.

[79] Plutarch also has Julius Proculus relate his encounter with Quirinus in a speech in the forum (*Rom.*28.1-3).

[80] Gosling says 'this is the only verbal link between the two accounts'. She defends this as a deliberate authorial allusion (with reference to Virgil's *Aeneid*) (2002: 60). Gosling also traces a slight echo of this line of the *Fasti* in the *Aeneid*, 'tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento/ (hae tibi erunt artes), pacisque imponere morem,/ parcere subiectis et debellare superbos' (*Aeneid* 6.851-53). However she acknowledges that this is a slight intertext.

[81] Murgatroyd describes the *Fasti*'s relationship with Livy as important but not as central as that with Virgil (2005: 171).

'horrueruntque comae' (*F*.2.502). There is also a notable difference in the time of day; Ovid's meeting between Romulus and Proculus takes place by the light of the moon 'luna fulgebat' (*F*.2.500), whereas the time is given as dawn in Livy (1.6).[82] Again the moonlight provides[83] a more frightening atmosphere for this tale.[84] Though Ovid, being Ovid, adds a hint of humour to the proceedings when the signal that the ghost of Romulus is about to materialise is some rustling in the hedges 'saepes tremuere sinistrae' (*F*.2.501) (Robinson 2010: 215 n.501). We see that Ovid's interest in the Julius Proculus story is primarily with recounting a dramatic narrative.[85]

In the *Fasti* Ovid is engaging in a 'process of "remythologization" and as a result Ovid portrays a lively, colourful and unpredictable wonder' (Murgatroyd 2005: 172). Both Livy and Ovid relate the rational explanation for Romulus' death, but only Ovid denies it. In Livy Julius Proculus states his meeting with Quirinus in public assembly (where Livy hints that this was a set up by the senate (1.16.5)).[86] In contrast Ovid describes the scene in the most hair-raising detail.[87] Here Ovid creates his own version of Roman history, a tactic we will witness many more times in our progression through the twice-told tales.

We will now examine the process of remythologisation in the *Fasti* as regards the explanation of Romulus' disappearance. Transportation to heaven is not the only explanation offered by contemporary sources: the other common

---

[82] Gosling notes that Livy's explanation is more plausible, a man walking from Alba Longa to Rome would more likely set out at first light (2002: 59). She also references Cicero's account, which describes Proculus as a farmer 'homini agresti' (*Rep*. 2.20) (an aspect of Proculus' character which neither Ovid nor Livy mention), and sees this as good justification of why Proculus is about so early (2002: 59 n.13).

[83] As well as providing sufficient light to make Proculus' identification certain (Robinson 2010: 214 n.500).

[84] For another comparison of Ovid and Livy's accounts of this apparition see Gosling (2002: 58-9). Gosling also notes some of the key differences between the Ovidian and Livian accounts not just of the meeting between Romulus and Proculus but more generally (2002: 58).

[85] If we follow Robinson's theory that there is an intertext between the episode directly prior to Romulus' apotheosis and this Julius Proculus incident, we will find this narrative not only dramatic but also a little humorous, undercutting Quirinus' grand declaration. Robinson also sees an echo between 'nec violent timidi piscibus ora Syri' (*F*.2.474) and Romulus's instruction to the Quirites not to weep 'nec violent' (*F*.2.506) (Robinson 2010: 216 n.506).

[86] Proculus as a senate stooge is hinted at in several sources. See Robinson (2010: 202 n.475-512) for further references.

[87] Murgatroyd notes that the lack of credulity regarding these ancient stories is essential to the character of the *Fasti* (2005: 176).

explanation was that he was murdered at the hands of the senators. Although the *Metamorphoses* sticks, without deviation, to apotheosis the *Fasti* does, however, dare to engage with this rational explanation of Romulus' disappearance (his murder at the hands of the senators): 'Luctus erat/ falsaque patres in crimine caedis' (*F*.2.497).[88]

Ovid, unlike Livy and Cicero, is careful to stress that the belief in Romulus' murder was incorrect. He mentions the rational explanation only briefly, 'falsaeque patres in crimine caedis' (*F*.2.497), and by positioning the adjective 'falsae' first, primes us that this version of the history is false before he recounts it. However Ovid, by mentioning this version of the myth with the precedent of Julius Caesar still fresh in the contemporary reader's mind, may have provided a much more realistic explanation. We must also remember that the deification which follows directly after that of Romulus is Fornax, an oven. The ridiculousness of an oven being deified may have a destabilising effect on the Romulean apotheosis: if an oven can be deified then Romulus is in poor company.

The *Metamorphoses* does not, unlike the *Fasti*, mention the alternative explanations for Romulus' death. But perhaps the rational explanation is implied? Julius Caesar proved a ready example of political assassination and in the *Metamorphoses* we find intratextual links made between Ovid's own accounts of the apotheosis of Romulus and that of Julius Caesar (*M*.15.745-870); see especially ' legi ipse animoque notavi' (*M*.15.814) for a parallel with 'nam memoro memorique animo pia verba notavi' (*M*.14.813). In addition the apotheosis of Romulus is part of a series of apotheoses at the end of the *Metamorphoses*, which culminates in that of Julius Caesar.[89]

---

[88] Note, as Gosling does, that this mention of the alternative reason for Romulus' death is so elided that one requires knowledge outside the text to make sense of it (2002: 58). One could interpret this in various ways. A 'suspicious' reader might argue that this pushes the reader out of the *Fasti* towards texts that treat the murder of Romulus with more credence. A 'supportive' reader might see the brevity as evidence for the narrator's lack of sympathy with this explanation (although the Alexandrian technique of displacing central elements of a tale in favour of minor ones is a technique frequently employed by Ovid).

[89] The catasterism of Julius Caesar is a point of interest for scholars. Gee notes that Julius Caesar's apotheosis was a potent expression of dynasty, 'the appearance during this period of ruler-catasterism as one way of expressing imperial succession' (2000: 7).

Both texts, then, may hint at the political murder of Julius Caesar, the *Fasti* through mentioning the rational version of Romulus' death, and balancing his apotheosis with the ridiculousness of the deification of an oven. The *Metamorphoses* achieves this tacit link with Julius Caesar's death through intratextual links between the two rulers' apotheoses. Both the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* also provide a mythologised account of Romulus' ascension, the *Metamorphoses* by its inclusion of Hersilia and the Greek mythology from which this story appears to be drawn. The *Fasti* does this by the 'remythologisation' of a historical narrative.

In both of Ovid's accounts of this myth the link between Romulus and Quirinus is made crystal clear, though in different ways.[90] In the *Metamorphoses* Romulus' ascent is immediately followed by the picture of Quirinus clad in a dignified ceremonial robe, 'pulchra subit facies et pulvinaribus altis/ dignior, est qualis trabeati forma Quirini' (*M*.14.827-828). As well as this narrator's description the *Metamorphoses* also has Iris speak of Romulus in heaven, 'nunc esse Quirini' (*M*.14.834), after which Romulus appears to Hersilia as Quirinus. With two goddesses plus the narrator bearing witness to Romulus' new divinity we can have no doubt on this score. In the *Fasti*, however, the identification of Romulus and Quirinus is taken for granted in the discussion of etymology that begins the section (*F*.2.475-480). Further support comes from the narrative when Quirinus appears to Julius Proculus and assures him of his new found divinity 'pulcher[91] et humano maior trabeaque decorus/ Romulus in media visus adesse via/ et dixisse simul…"tura ferant placentque novum pia turba Quirinum/ et patrias artes militiamque colant"' (*F*.2.503-508).[92] This divine apparition and the

---

[90] Various critics see the identification between Romulus and Quirinus as a point of political interest. Boyle supposes that the identification of Romulus and Quirinus was promoted by Julius Caesar (Boyle 2003: 249), whilst Barchiesi suggests that the identification was one that caused debate in the republican era (Barchiesi 1997: 113). Barchiesi further argues that the Julian family were principally responsible for the tight fusing of Quirinus and Romulus and as such this identification must have become a part of the Augustan remodelling of pre-Roman history (Barchiesi 1997: 113). Perhaps for this reason Ovid is the poet to take the Romulus/Quirinus identification further than any other poet (Barchiesi 1997: 114).

[91] This word seems frequently used of divine beauty (Robinson 2010: 215 n.503).

[92] Gosling finds a verbal echo between this line and *M*.14.827-8, 'pulchra subit facies et pulvinaribus altis/ dignior est qualis trabeati forma Quirini'. The relation between these two quotes may be partly explained by the use of words often associated with divinities (see Robinson

suitably reverent language it is couched in gives yet more weight to the argument that Ovid in the *Fasti* remythologises the historical version of Romulus' apotheosis.

Having touched on the balancing effect of pairing Romulus and Fornax on the same calendar entry, let us examine this a little further. The juxtaposition of Romulus' apotheosis and the Feast of Fools was not an inevitable one. Although 17th February was the usual date associated with the Quirinalia Ovid does not, in fact, describe the Quirinalia. Rather he narrates the apotheosis of Romulus, an event more usually associated with the 7th of July.[93] Some 'suspicious' scholars establish parallels and intertexts between the two events (Barchiesi 1997: 119),[94] including the pairing and the 'balancing effect' of the deification of Romulus and Fornax, mentioned above.

As well as the potentially destabilising effect of pairing Romulus and Fornax's apotheosis, there is one other effect of this juxtaposition of tales particularly pertinent for this thesis. Amongst Quirinus' communications to Proculus is the instruction that the Quirites should not mourn, that his cult should be propitiated and that Romans should practise military arts (*F*.2.505-508). These instructions can be read as meta-poetic comment, comment that affects our understanding of genre in Romulus' apotheosis.[95] The first of Romulus' instructions Hinds

---

above). In addition Gosling finds this slight verbal echo 'to draw attention to the final divergence of the two narratives rather than to link them, and therefore to point to a certain undependability and lack of authority in the myth' (2002: 57). There is no need to rely on a slight verbal confluence to make that argument; the extreme plot divergence does this quite adequately.

[93] See Robinson (2010: 204 n.475) for a summary of the dating evidence for Romulus' apotheosis. There is only one other source which gives February 17th as the date of his ascension and that is the *Fasti Silvi*, a 5th century text, most likely following the Ovidian tradition.

[94] The 'balancing effect' of adjacent episodes in the *Fasti* has been an important critical technique in the text's analysis. See particularly Newlands (1995).

[95] Quirinus' characterisation in general stresses his warlike tendencies. The *Fasti* spends six lines looking at the etymology of Quirinus, and Quirinus is characterised through these etymologies. For Quirinus, the etymology of the spear is accorded the first position and is two lines in length, (the other explanations (the Cures and the Quirites) being just one line long each), 'sive quod hasta curis priscis est dicta Sabinis/ (bellicus a telo venit in astra deus)' (*F*.2.477-8); the emphasis on the weapon 'spear' emphasises the war-likeness of the proto-Quirinus, Romulus. There is also a narrator's comment on the warlike nature of Quirinus/Romulus 'bellicus a telo venit in astra deus' (*F*.2.478) and this line, with its chiastic arrangement, emphasises the first word 'bellicus'. This emphasis on the word 'bellicus' again emphasises Romulus/Quirinus' warlike nature. Also Ovid includes more etymologies for this name than any other text surviving from antiquity, which seems to indicate Ovid having done some research (Robinson 2010: 206 n.477-480). This adds a scholarly, didactic tone to the *Fasti*.

describes as a tacit ban on elegy; lamentation being an essential component of that genre (1992: 120 n.7). The final instruction to practise arms could therefore be seen as an instruction to write epic poetry.[96] But the practice of military arts has, in the Feast of Fools, led to a neglect of agriculture (*F*.2.515f.) (Barchiesi 1997: 119).[97] One scholar sees the *Fasti*'s elegiac almost overset by Romulus' apotheosis, only to right itself with the neglect of farming caused by Quirinus' message to practise arms (Robinson 2010: iv). In this argument the Feast of Fools is the necessary counter to the very epic nature of the Romulus apotheosis narrative. The *Fasti*, especially when viewed in comparison to the *Metamorphoses*, may be seen to present a very epic version of Romulus' apotheosis. But within the wider context of the *Fasti*, the generic balance is tipped back towards elegy.

There is one last major point of comparison that this thesis will make between the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* apotheoses of Romulus: Remus. Remus, Romulus' brother, as Mars says in his speech in the *Fasti*, was the one of the twins who did not become a god, 'quamvis intercidit alter,/ pro se proque Remo, qui mihi restat, erit' (*F*.2.485-6). We now compare how the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* use this character differently.

Remus is a crucial character for the *Fasti* generally, appearing with frequency alongside his brother Romulus. Remus is a constant presence in book two of the *Fasti*, featuring in two early-Rome narratives in book two, other than his brother's apotheosis: the aetiology of the two colleges of the Luperci (*F*.2.359-380); his birth and exposure (*F*.2.381-424). In the apotheosis of Romulus in the *Fasti* Remus is also an explicit presence, with the naming of Remus and the statement that only one of Mars' sons survives. The very pervasiveness of Remus in the *Fasti* leads Hinds to argue that 'Ovid devotes more space to the death of Remus than befits a poet who really wishes to keep Romulus clear of the stigma of fratricide' (Hinds 1992: 143). Certainly Remus' death and the fratricide loom

---

[96] Indeed Gosling notes a similarity between the *F*.2.508 and *Aeneid* 6.851-53, 'tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento/ (hae tibi erunt artes), pacisque imponere morem,/ parcere subiectis et debellare superbos' (2002: 60). Romulus is echoing the words of another foundation figure, Anchises.

[97] In a wider context Romulus' uncultivated bellicosity could call into question the values of early *Romanitas*, which Augustus set out to restore. This is the view expounded by Hinds (1992: 129).

large in the version of his brother's apotheosis in the *Fasti*. As Remus' life story is a general theme in book two of the *Fasti*, the apotheosis of Romulus, in this context, may recall the mythology associated with Romulus and Remus, including Remus' fratricidal death.[98] The fratricide is very present in the *Fasti*, generally, being recounted at 4.807-862, but also mentioned in passing at 2.134, 2.143, 3.70, 5.452. Three references to the fratricide in this book must focus attention on this aspect of the myth.

Close reading substantiates this argument; there are further implicit references to Remus embedded in the apotheosis. The first of these references is in the *Fasti*'s description of 'nova moenia' (*F*.2.481). In the context of the apotheosis of Romulus, 'nova moenia' is sure to recall Remus leaping over the walls and his subsequent death. Indeed the first reference to Remus in the *Fasti* is a reference to the fratricide and to the walls he fatally traversed, 'moenia, tu dederas transilienda Remo' (*F*.2.134). The *Metamorphoses* instead uses a term much less likely to recall Remus, in the context of his brother's apotheosis, the more neutral 'fundamine' (*M*.14.808).

The *Fasti* also describes Romulus' actions at the moment he is snatched to heaven by Mars ('iura dabas' (*F*.2.492)) and, at first glance, this does not appear to bear significantly on our arguments concerning Remus. However it can be read as an intertext to the *Aeneid*'s 'iura dabunt' (1.293), where the Virgilian text refers to laws given by 'Remo cum fratre Quirinus' (*Aeneid* 1.292). If we see the *Aeneid* here as an intertext, Ovid's 'iura dabas' must surely draw attention to Romulus as the sole lawgiver, to the absence of Remus and implicitly to the fratricide. This is possibly heightened in the *Fasti* because it does choose to narrate Remus' death, and as Robinson notes 'as a result of the chronological structure of the *Fasti*, which fractures and disrupts the story of Romulus, we will not discover until book four that it was not Romulus but Celer who killed Remus (Robinson 2010: 211 n.492).

---

[98] Robinson sees Mars' reference to Remus as somewhat off hand (2010: 208 n.485).

The *Metamorphoses* does not mention Remus explicitly during Romulus'
apotheosis, nor does the text narrate Remus' death, so perhaps its interest in this
brother is less than that of the *Fasti*. However we must note that the phrase 'iura
dabas' also occurs in the *Metamorphoses* (*M*.14.806). Therefore an identical
phrase links the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* accounts. This phrase also helps,
via the Virgilian and *Fasti* intertexts, to subtly incorporate the fratricide into the
Metamorphoses. This thesis suggests that the *Metamorphoses* does have an
interest in Remus and the fratricide, but this is implicit only, unlike the overt
interest of the *Fasti*.[99]

Let us also note that Ovid by including Remus overtly in the *Fasti* and tacitly in
the *Metamorphoses* engages with contentious subject matters. Romans, at
troubled times of their history, were more than capable of reading the Romulus
and Remus story as a symbol of inter-Roman violence (see Horace *Epodes* 7)
(Wiseman 1995: 15). At the time the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* were composed,
in the later years of Augustus' life, there were dynastic feuds brewing, and this
myth may well have become more pointed in its meaning. Hinds states that 'for
Romulus, no publicity involving Remus can in the end be good publicity' (Hinds
1992: 143), whilst Wiseman goes so far as to assert that by the time of Augustus'
death 'no doubt sensible people took care not to mention Remus at all' (Wiseman
1995: 150). But the *Fasti* not only mentions Remus but also chooses to make his
relationship with his brother an unusually competitive one. Indeed in a highly
unusual episode it is Remus who outshines his brother. As has been noted by
commentators (Murgatroyd 2005: 12), in book two Remus emerges the
dominant, when he sees off bandits and arrives back at camp (and finishes all the
food) before his brother returns. Romulus acknowledges Remus as the superior
in that instance and laughs against himself.[100] Although the historical
engagement of the *Fasti* provides good cause, finding Remus explicitly included

---

[99] In fact, as Gosling notes, '[Ovid] will not pass over in tactful silence the problem of the
fratricide inherent in the foundation legend, but he introduces it obliquely through the
interconnections of his two apotheosis tales' (2002: 66).
[100] This not only disrupts the conventional power balance but is also another of the various tales
in the *Fasti* that end with laughter (Murgatroyd 2005: 12). Murgatroyd also proposes that Remus
achieves the upper hand, over his brother, again at *F*.5.451-486 where Remus appears as a ghost
to his brother and requests a day to honour ancestors, the Remuria (2005: 156). However this is a
much less strong example.

in the *Fasti* may increase our sense that the *Fasti* engages 'suspiciously' with its political context, to a greater extent than the *Metamorphoses*.

In conclusion to this chapter, Romulus' apotheosis has demonstrated how important and fruitful a comparison of Ovid's twice-told tales can be. The two accounts of Romulus' apotheosis have been shown to be highly interconnected. The preponderance of shared diction and shared motifs invites a comparative reading. Indeed, even where the two texts diverge to different endings they are linked by verbal echoes. This drive towards intertextuality between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* illuminates our understanding of both texts, highlights an intriguing relationship between them, particularly their generic relationship. It also creates greater generic tension.

The apotheosis of Romulus is a roller-coaster of a generic ride. The *Fasti*'s elegy is stretched to incorporate epic themes, and, only reestablishes a more elegiac tone by balancing the apotheosis of Romulus with the deification of Fornax. The *Metamorphoses*, as if to respond to the generically a-typical nature of the *Fasti*, has Mars' violent, warlike behaviour problematise itself with references to Mars' disarmament.

We have seen that the distinctions Hinds identified between the two Ovidian rapes of Persephone do not hold true for the apotheoses of Romulus, particularly as regards lamentation. With the inclusion of Hersilia's grief the *Metamorphoses* emphasises lamentation, but we argued for the precedent in tragedy, as well as elegy, of weeping widows. Therefore the *Metamorphoses*, is not necessarily engaging with elegy when it features lamentation.

This point also shows that the twice-told tales are not consistent in the demarcation between them. Lamentation may have been an elegiac marker in the *Fasti* version of Persephone's rape, but it is not in the *Metamorphoses* account of the apotheosis of Romulus. It also adds to this thesis' argument that the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* are texts of flux. Comparison of the twice-told tales shows both the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* in different moods. It also valuably illuminates the two texts.

Chapter Two: Callisto: Gender and Comedy

The next twice-told tale we will explore is the rape of Callisto. Radically different in tone and content to the apotheosis of Romulus, Callisto is the one of three rape myths which Ovid tells in both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* (the others being Europa and Persephone). In this chapter we embark upon a close reading and comparison of the two Ovidian narratives. We continue the focus upon genre, which we began in our comparison of the apotheosis of Romulus. However, in that chapter we concentrated on confusion of epic and elegiac genres; in this chapter we focus upon the inclusion of humour in both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*. As Callisto's story is a rape narrative this chapter also compares the presentation of gender, and gender play in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*.

This thesis' approach to this myth will be to focus on the protagonist, Callisto; to examine her presentation, her actions, and how the other actors, Diana, Jupiter, and Juno, act upon her. This approach has been selected because the mythography of the rape of Callisto shows the myth as one with interchangeable actors, and various (also to some extent interchangeable) set piece scenes (see below). It also allows for a focus on gender and gender play especially regarding the portrayal of Callisto. Out of this discussion there will arise some interesting notions on the themes of *arma* and comedy, which we then pursue at greater length.

It is worth noting at this early point that the inclusion of Callisto's catasterism is an unusual choice for both works. Callisto's is one of the few catasterisms to feature in *Metamorphoses*. Callisto is introduced into the *Fasti* as one of a number of myths told to explain the stars. Critics have seen the star myths as a way of introducing variety of tone and content into the *Fasti* (Murgatroyd 2005: 110).[101] Today the inclusion of these star myths is generally critically understood

---

[101] The star myths have also been used as a method to negotiate the complex generic dynamic of the *Fasti,* a method pioneered by Gee; 'Astronomy is part of poetry in many genres and may not be confined to elegiac, epic or didactic writing. In this sense astronomy is a good way to study the generic fluidity of Ovid's *Fasti* itself' (Gee 2000: 21). Hinds, in his 1992 article, proposes that epic, in so far as it is associated with *arma*, is in the *Fasti* placed in opposition not only with

as allowing the introduction of Greek material into a text that might otherwise be focused entirely on the Roman (Gee 2000: 2) (Robinson 2010: ix) (Newlands 1995: 44).[102] That inclusion of Callisto's rape in either text was unusual makes a comparison even more pointed, the fact that it features in both texts is remarkable. Also neither of the two versions follows any recognisable previous version (see below) and yet Ovid follows this same unusual version in both accounts of this tale.

The two rapes of Callisto have been compared, previously by scholars. Heinze (1960: 385-388) analysed them by their elegiac/epic criteria, as he did for the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* generally. Johnson (1996) has also compared the two and his paper is the most stimulating, because some points are well made, and some less so: we will pursue his findings below. Murgatroyd in his investigation into the *Fasti* also discussed Callisto and its relationship to the *Metamorphoses* version: his analysis adopted some elements from narratology to good effect (Murgatroyd 2005: esp. 71-5). Then in 2010, Robinson's commentary on book two of the *Fasti* noted the high degree of allusiveness between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, and then diagnoses the later as 'full of misdirection, playful allusion, and other narrative tricks' (Robinson 2010: 103). Increasingly, therefore scholarship suggests that like the rapes of Persephone and the apotheoses of Romulus the two Ovidian texts are linked intertextually. This thesis will investigate whether such a link could indeed be said to exist and, if so, to what effect.

We begin with some essential preliminaries. The *Fasti*'s account of the rape of Callisto is located in book two of the text and has fairly clear-cut boundaries (*F*.2.153-192). The *Metamorphoses* account is also located in its second book but, as often in the *Metamorphoses*, the boundaries are more fluid (approximately 2.401-535). There is also one difference that is clear from these preliminaries: the *Metamorphoses'* account of the rape of Callisto, at

the conventional Augustan *mollities* of elegy (that is to say with erotic elegy), but also with *sacra* and *sidera* (Hinds 1992: 113). By extension, therefore, he aligns the *sacra* and the *sidera* with the elegiac genre. The star myths then provide an excellent insight into the *Fasti*, and a comparison between a star myth in the *Fasti* and its companion piece in the *Metamorphoses* may be highly illuminating.

[102] For a differing interpretation of these star myths see Martin (1985).

(approximately) 135 hexameter lines long (2.401-535), is much longer than that of the *Fasti* which is only 40 elegiac lines long (2.153-192).[103]

Despite this difference in length, both the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* versions of the rape of Callisto follow the same essential pattern: Jupiter desires Callisto, rapes and impregnates her. On discovering her acolyte's pregnancy, Diana banishes Callisto from her train. Callisto then gives birth to a son Arcas, before being turned into a bear, as a punishment from Juno. After fifteen years wandering in the woods as a bear, Callisto meets her son, Arcas, who is terrified by the appearance of this bear and almost kills her. However the matricide is prevented when they are both transported to the stars. Juno rages against their catasterism and begs Tethys never to allow this constellation to set.[104]

Although the broad outline of the myth which Ovid presents is similar, that is not to imply that he delivers an identical version of the myth in two texts. Each text emphasises different elements of this story and has some unique features: for example, in the *Metamorphoses* Jupiter disguises himself as Diana, while the *Fasti* includes Callisto's oath of chastity to Diana (*F*.2.157-161). We will examine the significance of these variations below.

The version of the Callisto story that Ovid relates was by no means the only version of the myth in antiquity; there were many other possibilities. To give a few examples, Callisto is raped by Jupiter in his own appearance in all versions except that of Amphis, where Jupiter is said to appear as Diana, and Apollodorus, who records the alternative disguise of Apollo. Callisto is transformed into a bear by Diana in the *Catasterisms* and in Amphis; Apollodorus records Jupiter as the agent of transformation, whilst it is thought Callimachus depicted Juno as the agent. The transformation is explained as punishment for lost virginity in the *Catasterisms*; as punishment for naming Diana as rapist in Amphis; as Jupiter's attempt to conceal the rape from Juno in Apollodorus; as Juno's jealousy in Callimachus. Callisto is almost shot by Arcas in the *Catasterisms* and Amphis.

---

[103] Nine of the eleven rapes in the *Fasti* are short, as Murgatroyd notes (2005: 65). The only exceptions are the rapes of Lucretia and Persephone.
[104] Virgil also describes this, 'Arctos Oceani metuentis aequore tingi' (*Georgics* 1.246).

Callisto is shot by Diana at Juno's suggestion in Apollodorus and Callimachus, although Apollodorus gives the alternative version that Callisto was shot by Diana as punishment for her loss of virginity (Henrichs 1987: 256f.). Henrichs (1987: 261) argues that the two key elements are Callisto's loss of virginity and the bear transformation. However Gantz (1993: 728) gives examples of coins that show Callisto being shot whilst human, therefore implying that bear transformation was not part of all strands of this myth.[105] Overall it seems that the Ovidian version of the myth conflates two traditions, the Eratosthenic and the Callimachean traditions (Robinson 2010: 103).

Heinze argued that Ovid introduced several elements to the Callisto myth including: the bath scene; vengeful Juno metamorphosising Callisto and delaying said metamorphosis until after the birth of Arcas; Arcas' near murder of his mother (Heinze 1960: 386-7). But if one looks more closely one finds that they may already have been established in the literary tradition. If we look first at the bath scene we find that it occurs in Hyginus (*Astr.* 2.1) and in the pseudo-Eratosthenic *Catasterisms*, which is claimed to originate from the Hesiodic Corpus (*Catast.* 1). Ovid may develop his bath scene by reference to the Callimachean bath scene in Hymn V, *Baths of Pallas* (Otis 1970: 387). Again, in the Eratosthenic *Catasterisms*, Callisto is almost killed by Arcas and the Arcadians (Hesiod fr. 163). So the idea of Callisto being killed by her unwitting son was already present in the mythological tradition. The Callimachean version is also thought to give Juno as the agent of the animal transformation.

Having now laid the foundations for this section, let us build upon these with analysis of character and narrative set pieces. We begin with Callisto, the central character of this myth, whose portrayal is markedly different in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*. Her gender will be argued to be particularly important to this narrative (especially so in the *Metamorphoses*) and will be the focus of our comparison of her presentation.

---

[105] For further information on the mythography see Henrichs (1987: 254-267) and Gantz (1993: 254-67).

In the *Metamorphoses* Callisto is first described as not participating in the traditional female occupation of weaving: 'non erat huius opus lanam mollire[106] trahendo' (*M*.2.411). In this way Callisto is characterised as outside the normal gender boundaries. But, like any negative statement, the line quoted above draws attention to what she is not doing, she is not weaving, she is not behaving like a typical woman *but she is a woman*. The stress on non-conformative behaviour highlights, conversely, that she is female. We can begin to see that Callisto's femininity is an important part of her characterisation in the *Metamorphoses*.

The *Metamorphoses* develops this into a physical description of Callisto 'nec positu variare comas; ubi fibula vestem,/ vitta coercuerat neglectos alba capillos' (*M*.2.411-413). Here we see the focus upon Callisto's neglected hair, only restrained by her holy bands. The inclusion of the *vitta* renders these two lines more appropriate but one suspects that this was simply an excuse to mention Callisto's unordered locks. The attractiveness of unkempt hair was a *topos* in elegiac poetry; Propertius mentions the attractiveness of Cynthia's unkempt hair at *Elegies*, 2.1.7-8; and Ovid in *Ars* 3.145 describes it as an attractive hairstyle for some women, 'Huic decet inflatos laxe iacuisse capillos.' Ovid also includes this motif elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses* in connection to another *rapta*, Daphne, who also had unkempt hair and wore a holy headdress, 'vitta coercebat positos sine lege capillos' (1.477). Both Callisto and Daphne are described in terms of their attractive physical appearance and femininity, and are offered as objects for the reader's gaze.[107]

This is in contrast to the *Fasti* where Callisto's physical appearance is not described until *F*.2.161 and then only with one adjective, 'formosa'.[108] Later in

---

[106] The emphasis on gender, on femaleness is further heightened in this line by Ovid's use of 'mollire' (*M*.2.411) to describe women's action with wool. The word and its cognate *mollitia* were 'so closely aligned in Roman discursive systems with the feminine that the term was claimed to be derived from *mulier* or "woman" (cf. Isidorus in his *Origines* 10.179)' (Wyke 2002: 169 n.65).

[107] Essential to the feminist reinterpretation of Ovidian rape is the act of viewing. Both the male gaze, and the representation of women as objects for the male gaze have come under scrutiny by feminists. Richlin says of Daphne in the *Metamorphoses*, 'Indeed your looking at her is the point' (1992: 162). This could equally well apply to Callisto. See Richlin (1992) for further on the gaze in Roman literature.

[108] Callisto is named in the *Fasti* and so her name's connotations of beauty are included, but see below for my argument on why Callisto is named in the *Fasti*; it is not, I believe, to emphasise her attractiveness. Murgatroyd has already looked at the physical description of the *raptae* in the

the tale another narratorial comment notes that a brief while ago this ugly bear was loved by Jove, implying, though not stating, that she was once beautiful, 'ursa per incultos errabat squalida montes,/ quae fuerat summo nuper amata Iovi' (*F*.2.181-2). Murgatroyd calls this analeptic reference 'brief but tragic' (Murgatroyd 2005: 19).

The *Fasti* does not focus on Callisto's gender by emphasising her physical appearance. Rather the *Fasti* stresses Callisto's status as a servant to Diana,[109] 'inter Hamadryadas iaculatricemque Dianam/ Callisto sacri pars fuit una chori' (*F*.2.155-56). The most prominent feature in the *Fasti* narrative is not Callisto's beauty but rather her vow of chastity which she makes to Diana (*F*.2.157-160). This occupies five of the total forty lines, a considerable proportion of this version:

> illa deae tangens arcus 'quos tangimus arcus
> > este meae testes virginitatis' ait.
> Cynthia[110] laudavit, 'promissa' que 'foedera serva,
> > et comitum princeps[111] tu mihi' dixit 'eris'. (F2.157-60).

Given the *Fasti*'s abbreviated nature, the oath gains special prominence, owing to the number of lines it occupies in a short account (*F*.2.157-161),[112] but it also striking that this element of the myth is told in the *Fasti* but not the *Metamorphoses*. This vow may also allow the reader to draw a more sympathetic portrait of Callisto, than the voyeuristic and exploitative *Metamorphoses* allows.

Fasti and found that of them Lucretia alone has her appearance much described and some (Juturna, Lara etc.) do not have any mention of their appearance (2005: 64). This would appear to be a trend within the *Fasti* of which Callisto is part, and becomes more prominent here by its contrast with the *Metamorphoses*.

[109] The relationship between Diana and Callisto was an element of the Callisto myth central to the earliest versions (Henrichs 1987: 264).

[110] The name Cynthia, although an acceptable epithet for the goddess Diana, is an unusual one. It also has strong connotations of Propertius' elegiac poetry, as the name of his mistress (Robinson 2010: 109 n.159). This name may introduce a modicum of generic instability, flagging that the myth of Callisto may easily be similar to Ovid's earlier elegiac love poetry and also irony that Cynthia is involved in a vow of chastity. As the narrative proceeds we discover that it is not identical to Ovid's earlier love poetry; it becomes quite a different sort of elegy.

[111] Robinson points out that 'princeps' used to describe Callisto is striking following, as it does, so soon upon the *Fasti*'s celebration of the term applied to Augustus (*F*.2.142) (2010: 109 n.160).

[112] Murgatroyd views this oath as a hook to draw the reader into the narrative, playing upon the readers' knowledge of this myth (2005: 222).

The *Fasti* also focuses on the relationship between Diana and Callisto by suggesting an alternative future, what might have been but for Jupiter's intervention.

Diana's response to Callisto's vow is one of the ways this is achieved, 'Cynthia laudavit, "promissa" que "foedera serva,/ et comitum princeps tu mihi" dixit "eris"'(*F*.2.159-160). The delay of 'eris', Callisto's potential future self, to the end of the second line of Diana's response, and the unusual placement of 'dixit' also emphasise this reading, as does the contrast of the future and past tenses. The theme of 'what might have been' is continued in the *Fasti* with a narrator's comment on Callisto's intention to keep her vow, an intention broken only by her beauty, 'foedera servasset, si non formosa fuisset' (*F*.2.161).[113] Here the pluperfect subjunctives intensify the emphasis on Callisto's conditional future. By including a hint of Callisto's life, unmarred by Jupiter's lust, the *Fasti* allows for a pathetic presentation of Callisto's myth. More so because the reader knows, with tragic inevitability, that Callisto will be raped and the friendship between Diana and Callisto shattered.

So we can see that where the *Metamorphoses* dwells on Callisto's physicality the *Fasti* dwells on her virginal friendship with Diana. However the relationship between Diana and Callisto does feature in the *Metamorphoses* albeit in a rather twisted fashion. With this in mind, let us turn to examine Jupiter's roles in these Ovidian narratives. His primary role, as Callisto's rapist, is the same in both texts. However, there is a high degree of difference in the presentation of Jupiter between the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*. As the Diana/Callisto relationship is central to the *Fasti*, Jupiter is sidelined in the *Fasti*'s account of the rape. Grammatically, Callisto is the subject rather than the object of the rape, 'de Iove crimen habet' (*F*.2.162) and, as we can see from this quote, the rape is brief, inexplicit.[114] Jupiter's other key action in this myth, the catasterism of Callisto and her son Arcas, is also downplayed. In the *Fasti* the agent of the apotheosis is

---

[113] The *Metamorphoses* also has a narrator's comment in a similar point in the narrative, but this is a generalized and more elevated remark on the brevity of power, 'sed nulla potentia longa est' (*M*.2.416).

[114] Callisto's rape is similar to most of the other rapes in the *Fasti*, where it is usual for the rape scene itself to be extremely brief or entirely elided (Murgatroyd 2005: 69). Europa's rape is also very curtailed, and we will examine it in the following section.

unnamed, and although Jupiter is the most likely candidate, his role in this myth is further diminished.[115] Besides these two key moments, Jupiter is mentioned just twice, after Callisto's metamorphosis, in a narratorial comment and then in a speech by Juno, 'quid facis? Invito est pectore passa Iovem./ utque ferae vidit turpes in paelice voltus,/ "huius in amplexus Iuppiter" inquit "eat!" (*F*.2.178-180).[116] Even though Jupiter is mentioned here the focus is not on him but rather on Juno and her vengeance. As we have seen, Jupiter's role in the *Fasti* rape is very much subordinate to Callisto's relationship with Diana. Johnson puts it nicely when he says that in the *Fasti* 'representations of Jupiter's lust and aggression don't divert our attention from the image of this virginal friendship' (1996: 16).

The converse is true of the *Metamorphoses*, Jupiter's actions and the rape are much more central to the narrative, and the Diana/Callisto relationship is squeezed out to the margins. The rape of Callisto in the *Metamorphoses* opens with a description of Jupiter as 'pater omnipotens', a very dignified description, surveying and tending to the 'ingentia moenia caeli' (*M*.2.401). This grand opening continues with Jupiter's restoring Arcadia, following Phaethon's fiery descent. Here are a series of simple, relatively unadorned phrases using one lone adjective, 'laesas' (*M*.2.408). This dignified and simple introduction contrasts all the more sharply with the undignified behaviour which follows; Jupiter swiftly becomes entangled in his amorous affair. He does so in this fashion: whilst he is tending the walls of Arcadia Jupiter catches sight of Callisto. But a verb of seeing is not used, rather Ovid employs the verb 'haesit' (*M*.2.410), and its meaning 'cling to' gives a sense of the unwanted nature of Jupiter's attention. Indeed the delay of 'haesit' by enjambment increases the emphasis on this word, and also delays the reader's knowledge of exactly what action Jupiter performed

---

[115] It has been suggested that Juno may also be the agent of the apotheosis in the *Fasti* as a form of eternal punishment (Johnson 1996: 92).

[116] Robinson here sees a triumphant Juno admiring her creation (2010: 113 n.179). Robinson also discusses how we could interpret 'in paelice' here; as focalized through Juno, or as simply an Ovidian convention, or adding ironic humour at a rape victim being called a mistress (2010: 113 n.179). The *Metamorphoses* passage also describes Callisto as paelex, more emphatically than the *Fasti*, using the term three times (*M*.2.469, 508, 530). This greater characterisation of Callisto as a mistress adds to the sense of Juno's rage in this text. The *Metamorphoses* use of this word carries a much greater focalization of Juno's perspective than the *Fasti* account, which, as we have seen from Robinson, is more open to debate. As we shall see Juno's anger is important to the *Metamorphoses*.

on Callisto at this stage of the narrative; the rape is prefigured. Already we find the *Metamorphoses* building greater tension into its narrative by prefiguring the rape and by establishing early on the unwanted nature of Jupiter's attentions. Seeing Callisto also causes a fire of desire to burn in Jupiter 'et accepti caluere sub ossibus ignes' (*M*.2.410). The literal, external fire which Jupiter was surveying in line *M*.2.402 has become a metaphorical, internal fire some eight lines later at *M*.2.410.

The contrast between the dignified opening and the rest of Jupiter's actions in this myth becomes most apparent when Jupiter disguises himself as Diana, a crucial part of his role in the *Metamorphoses*; he assumes the goddess' appearance in order to gain access to Callisto.[117] We noted above the focus upon Callisto's gender in the *Metamorphoses* version of her rape. Jupiter's disguise as Diana continues the text's interest in gender; here it becomes gender play: the masculine but beautiful Callisto and the uber-male god Jupiter disguised as a woman. Transvestite rape is also a motif of the *Metamorphoses* more widely (*M*.4.217-33, *M*.11.310), as Richlin notes (1992: 169). She quotes the Callisto rape as an example *par excellence* of this phenomenon 'Jupiter disguised as Diana embraces Callisto and "nec se sine crimine prodit;" ... gender revelation equals penetration' (Richlin 1992: 169). Johnson describes 'the nasty irony of the disguise' (1996: 10) and speculates that the disguise 'designs[s] an exciting lesbian moment for the masculine gaze' (1996: 11). It also continues the emphasis on gender that we have observed elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses*. Jupiter's disguise also offers moments of dark comedy such as, 'ridet et audit/ et sibi preferri se gaudet' (*M*.2.429-30), when Callisto praises this 'Diana' higher than Jupiter himself[118] as well as Callisto hiding from Diana in fear that it might be Jupiter again, 'clamata refugit/ et timuit primo, ne Iuppiter esset in illa' (*M*.2.443-4).

---

[117] The only pre-Ovidian example, which survives, of Jupiter disguising himself as Diana is from Amphis, the Athenian comic poet of approximately the 4th Century BC (Amphis fr. 46 (Austin 1991)).

[118] This trick also has an epic precedent occurring in *Odyssey* 13.262, when Odysseus fails to recognise Athene. Ovid himself utilises this trick a second time in the *Metamorphoses* 5.676-707.

In addition this thesis argues that his disguise performs one more, intriguing, intertextual act. If one looks closely at Jupiter's speech, whilst disguised as Diana, in the *Metamorphoses* and compares it to Diana's own speech in the *Fasti* certain similarities emerge. Jupiter uses 'comitum' (*M*.2.426) also used by Diana (*F*.2.160); 'virgo' is a noun used by both Jupiter (*M*.2.426) and Diana (*F*.2.167); Callisto is described as 'sacri pars fuit una chori' (*F*.2.156) and Jupiter calls her 'pars una mearum' (*M*.2.426). It seems that Jupiter is imitating Diana's language to make his trick more convincing to Callisto and more cruel.[119] But is he just generally imitating Diana, or is he specifically incorporating and subverting Diana's own language and the narratorial description in the *Fasti*? This thesis argues for the latter option; the similarity between Jupiter and Diana's language, though not inevitable, is marked enough to send us back and forth between the two accounts.[120]

A close reading of the rape scene reveals the continuing importance of gender. The rape scene, like all of Jupiter's actions in the *Metamorphoses*, is important to the narrative and tone of this version. So much so that a total of 23 lines are devoted to the subject (*M*.2.417-440).[121] The account of the rape opens with a description of the time of day, it is hot and sunny; 'ulterius medio spatium sol altus habebat,/ cum subit illa nemus, quod nulla ceciderat aetas' (*M*.2.417-8). This description prepares the reader for Callisto's rape because Jupiter has already himself made the connection, in the *Metamorphoses*, between shaded groves and the rape of Io:

---

[119] Although this can be read the other way round, that Diana, in the *Fasti*, commends Callisto's chastity in terms similar to those which Jupiter, in the *Metamorphoses* uses just before he destroys it (Robinson 2010: 109 n.160).

[120] Regarding chronology it appears that the *Fasti* version is referring to the *Metamorphoses*, with the abbreviated story and the misleading of the reader into false anticipation of the rape in the *Fasti*. However, if one accepts that Jupiter's language in the *Metamorphoses* is stolen from Diana in the *Fasti* then the reader can read from the *Metamorphoses* back to the *Fasti*. Alternatively the reader could gain insight into Jupiter's behaviour in the *Metamorphoses* version when reading the *Fasti*. No clear overall chronology emerges between these twin stories. It is Hinds' contention that we should read the two accounts together, 'No consistent pattern emerges: here as elsewhere they seem to be mutually dependent' (Hinds 1987: 44).

[121] The terms 'phallocentric' and 'phallagocentric' coined by Derrida to convey the privileging of the phallus in knowledge systems, are here useful in our understanding of Callisto in the *Metamorphoses*. In a very real way the story is phallogocentric; it revolves around the phallus.

> Viderat a patrio redeuntem Iuppiter illam
> flumine et 'o virgo Iove digna tuoque beatum
> nescio quem factura toro, pete' dixerat 'umbras
> altorum nemorum' (et nemorum monstraverat umbras)
> 'dum calet, et medio sol est altissimus orbe!
> quodsi sola times latebras intrare ferarum,
> praeside tuta deo nemorum secreta subibis,
> nec de plebe deo, sed qui caelestia magna
> sceptra manu teneo, sed qui vaga fulmina mitto. (*M*.1.588-596)

Looking outside of the *Metamorphoses* we find mid-day heat was already established as an erotic time of day in Ovid's poetry (one example is *Amores* 1.5.1-8 and the emphasis placed there upon mid-day time and light).

In addition to the time and setting the reader has also been prepared for Callisto's rape in another, subtle, manner. We noticed the emphasis on Callisto's femininity in her initial description. This theme becomes more fully developed in the rape scene, 'illa quidem contra, quantum modo femina posset/…illa quidem pugnat, sed quem superare puella/ quisve Iovem poterat?' (*M*.2.434-437). The emphasis on the inferior strength of female Callisto and the repetition of feminine pronouns 'illa', 'femina' (*M*.2.434), 'illa' again and 'puella' (*M*.2.436) all combine to make Callisto's gender especially prominent in the *Metamorphoses* rape scene.

The presentation of Callisto's rape is quite different in the *Fasti*. There is no emphasis on Callisto's gender and the inexplicit rape is compressed into one line (*F*.2.162), only half of which is strictly related to the rape 'de Iove crimen habet'. The brevity of this description neatly demonstrates the lack of interest in the rape in the *Fasti*. Nor, in the *Fasti*, is the reader prepared for Callisto's rape: in fact the situation is quite the reverse, as we will see below. This *Fasti* account has little in the way of narrative tension, at least as far as the rape is concerned. Nor are Callisto's struggles described; indeed the only way the reader would know that Jupiter's attentions were unwanted, other than extrapolating this from the oath, comes from one narratorial comment, 'invito est pectore passa Iovem' (*F*.2.178) which comes after the rape. Even then the focus of this comment is not upon Callisto's suffering but rather on the unjust nature of Juno's punishment. The word 'crimen' may contain a suggestion of guilt, but this could be explained

as focalisation of the events through Callisto's perspective, possibly alluding to the greater interest in Callisto's psychological sufferings in the *Metamorphoses* (Robinson 2010: 109 n.162). However if there is focalisation, and an intertextual link, here the effect is quite weak: it adds little impact to the story. Overall the rape in the *Fasti* is an undramatic affair, especially compared with the *Metamorphoses*.

But are Ovid's two versions of the rape scene both completely opposed? Certainly they are in the ways we have expounded above but there is one crucial way in which the two scenes of Callisto's rape intersect: there is some use of similar diction in the two accounts. But this similarity of diction is used, not only to signpost the existence of the other account but also to misdirect the reader. Let us compare 'mille feras Phoebe silvas venata redibat/ aut plus aut medium sole tenente diem' (*F*.2.163-164) with 'ulterius medio spatium sol altus habebat,/ cum subit illa nemus, quod nulla ceciderat aetas' (*M*.2.417-418). Here we see a similar description used of a similar time of day, 'medium sole tenente diem' (*Fasti*) and 'medio spatium sol altus habebat' (*Metamorphoses*). What is significant is that the *Metamorphoses* quote is setting the scene for Callisto's rape, it being a typical setting for rape (woodland shade about mid-day, as we discussed above). In the *Fasti* 'de Iove crimen habet' (*F*.2.162) suggests the rape scene might be about to be related. Then the setting of the scene, the description of the woods at midday (*F*.2.163-4), continues the expectation, especially so given that it is the prelude to the rape in the *Metamorphoses*. A reader who knows the *Metamorphoses* version will be frustrated in his expectation of the rape scene in the *Fasti* (Robinson 2010: 110 n.163-6).[122] Again the rape itself is sidelined in the *Fasti*, as it disappears like a will-o-the-wisp of language.

---

[122] A similar type of misled expectations is noted by Murgatroyd in the account of Aristaeus and his bees. There the strong intertext with Virgil's *Georgics* suggests that after Aristaeus Ovid will proceed to the Eurydice and Orpheus story but then fails to recount this myth (Murgatroyd 2005: 12). As Murgatroyd notes, 'Ovid is perfectly capable of mischievously trying to mislead his readers' (Murgatroyd 2005: 103). Although Murgatroyd says this in the context of the Ovidian-Virgilan link, it is also applicable to the misled expectations between the two versions of this tale in Ovid's oeuvre.

The difference in emphasis which we have noted regarding Jupiter's level of involvement in the narratives continues after the rape.[123] In the *Fasti* the rape is Jupiter's final named action; the apotheosis is not definitively attributed to him. In the *Metamorphoses* however, Jupiter returns to the heavens following the rape, 'superum petit aethera victor/ Iuppiter' (*M*.2.437-8). The name Jupiter is not needed here for the sense, it is clear to whom 'victor' (*M*.2.437) refers. This pleonasm highlights Jupiter as the author of the conquest and the enjambment of 'Iuppiter' only serves to further enhance this.[124] However given the nature of Jupiter's victory, and the usual context in which the word 'victor' was used, (of conquering people of great nations or armies, for example, Cicero *On Divination* 2.26.56) this emphasis could also be ironic. Or it might be reminiscent of Jupiter's cult name Jupiter Invictus. In contrast to Jupiter, and the emphasis placed on his name, Callisto remains nameless: her status as Jove's inferior is confirmed.

As we saw above, almost the reverse occurs in the *Fasti*. Callisto is named (*F*.2.156) and it is Jupiter's name that is downplayed; he is named only three times in this version (*F*.2.162, 180 &182). There is also one crucial moment when, as the agent of the apotheosis, his name is entirely omitted. We may assume it was Jupiter but the *Fasti* does not confirm this. Again and again we see that Jupiter's actions in the *Fasti* are downgraded to make way for the Diana-Callisto story arc.[125] Here, by being named, Callisto gains a prominence in the *Fasti* version which is all the sharper for reading the two accounts together.

---

[123] Murgatroyd sees the focus of the *Fasti* Callisto being on the events following the rape (2005: 71). I would disagree; the prominence of the vow helps balance the story either side of the rape itself. However I concede that the presence of the vow inevitably points towards the breaking of the vow (and as we will see, the vow may contain a reference to the very instrument by which it is destroyed).

[124] Cixous offers a useful feminist perspective on victory, 'And we perceive that the 'victory' always amounts to the same thing: it is hierachised. The hierachisation subjects the entire conceptual organisation to man. A male privilege, which can be seen in the opposition by which it sustains itself, between activity and passivity. Traditionally, the question of sexual difference is coupled with the same opposition: activity/passivity.' (1988: 288). In light of this perspective it is interesting that we find in Jupiter an equation between sexual activity and victory.

[125] Characterisation of the rapist is generally avoided in the *Fasti* (Murgatroyd 2005: 65) although the rape of Callisto, with its almost virtual elision of Jupiter takes this to new extremes. Indeed it is not only rapists that enjoy little characterisation in the *Fasti*; one of the key features of this text appears to be the virtual elision of key characters (Murgatroyd 2005: 156).

Having now surveyed Jupiter's actions let us move on to tackle the consequences of the rape; Diana suggests to her train of nymphs that they bathe, and Callisto's pregnancy is discovered (*M*.2.441-465, *F*.2.163-174). The two 'discovery scenes' have very similar narratives, and offer a strong invitation to compare with some strong verbal echoes; the identical method of discovery is highlighted with closely allied phrases in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* to describe the Nymphs undressing, 'cunctae velamina ponunt' (*M*.2.460) and 'nymphae velamina ponunt' (*F*.2.169).[126] The similarity in diction here echoes the basic similarity in the method of the discovery of Callisto's pregnancy. This description of the nymphs undressing is accompanied in both texts by a description of Callisto's reluctance to undress:

> Parrhasis erubuit; cunctae velamina ponunt;
> una moras quaerit: dubitanti vestis adempta est,
> qua posita nudo patuit cum corpore crimen
> attonitae manibusque uterum celare volenti (*M*.2.460-463).

> dixerat et nymphis: nymphae velamina ponunt,
>   hanc pudet et tardae dat mala signa morae.
> exuerat tunicas; uteri manifesta tumore
>   proditur indicio ponderis ipsa suo (*F*.2.169-172).

The echoes in diction in these quotes are restricted to those instances mentioned above but the picture as a whole is remarkably similar. Except that the *Metamorphoses*, ever the more voyeuristic, has the nymphs undress Callisto. The *Fasti* at least allows her the dignity of removing her own clothing (Robinson 2010: 111 n.169).

The two discovery scenes have quite distinct identities. In the *Fasti* this scene becomes a very important element of the myth, as the numbers show us; twelve of its forty lines are given over to it. This scene is so vitally important to the *Fasti* because it sees the destruction of the Diana/Callisto friendship, a theme central to the *Fasti*'s version of the myth. Indeed Diana speaks marginally more words to Callisto in the dreadful moment of discovery, nine words, as opposed to seven words in the *Metamorphoses*. The discovery scene also follows on

---

[126] Note again Callisto's body exposed to the reader's gaze.

naturally from the vow of chastity; this being the moment when Diana discovers that the vow has been broken. The vow is what gives the discovery scene its poignancy as can be seen from a closer examination of the language. Diana declares that they shall bathe; '"Hic" ait "in silva, virgo Tegeaea, lavemur!"/ erubuit falso virginis illa sono.' (*F*.2.167-8). Note the polyptoton of 'virgo' and 'virginis', and the separation of 'falso' from its noun 'sono', all these combine to highlight Callisto's pretence of virginity. Even after her pregnancy has been discovered the *Fasti* continues to display its concern with Callisto's pretend virginity, 'quae fuerat virgo credita, mater erat' (*F*.2.176). The *Fasti*, by emphasising this element of 'deception' in Callisto's behaviour, reminds the reader of the oath of chastity.

In addition, when read side by side with the *Metamorphoses,* the *Fasti* discovery scene may be thought to stand in place of the rape scene. The rape is so elided in the *Fasti*, and the preparations for the bath scene closely echo those made before the rape in the *Metamorphoses* (as discussed above), that the discovery scene, rather than the rape becomes the central element of Callisto's downfall in this version.

Comparing the two versions of Diana's words when banishing Callisto also gives some illuminating insights. When Diana banishes Callisto, 'cui dea "virgineos, periura Lycaoni, coetus/ desere nec castas pollue" dixit "aquas"' (*F*.2.173-4)[127] she uses language in the *Fasti*, which is very similar to that used in the *Metamorphoses,* '"I procul hinc" dixit "nec sacros pollue fontis"' (*M*.2.464). Here synonyms are employed rather than identical diction but the use of 'pollue' in a near-identical metrical position strengthens the pull between the two versions. There are, however, a couple of important differences. Given the importance the *Fasti* has placed upon Callisto remaining chaste we should not be surprised to find that the 'sacros' waters of the *Metamorphoses* have become the 'castas' waters of the *Fasti.* Also in the *Fasti* the word 'periura' (*F*.2.173) is used, which highlights Callisto's perjury and refers back to the vow made by

---

[127] The precise reason why Callisto would pollute the waters is not agreed upon. Robinson's commentary provides two: Callisto's pregnancy or her rape. This thesis prefers the explanation that it is the loss of virginity that causes the pollution, this tying in with the emphasis on virginity demonstrated by the oath.

Callisto earlier in this version. The concern shown for Callisto's untruths makes Diana's anger at Callisto's loss of virginity more understandable in the *Fasti* version than that of the *Metamorphoses*, it allows the reader to sympathise, to an extent, with Diana's decision to banish Callisto: Diana feels betrayed. Here we have seen the denouement of Callisto's friendship with Diana; it ends in bleak misunderstanding with betrayal on both sides.

The *Metamorphoses*, without the same focus on the Diana/Callisto relationship, still manages to make this a tense and dramatic scene, but in a different way to that of the *Fasti*. The discovery scene in the *Metamorphoses* opens with an exclamation, 'ecce' (*M*.2.441) which provides a transition from the rape scene to Diana's return:

> Ecce, suo comitata choro Dictynna per altum
> Maenalon ingrediens et caede superba ferarum
> Adspicit hanc visamque vocat (*M*.2.441-3)

Already the *Metamorphoses* builds into its narrative the possibility of discovery; Callisto could have been discovered by Diana at the scene of her rape. Another exclamation 'heu' follows a few lines later (*M*.2.447), and again this exclamation revolves around the difficulty of concealing the rape from Diana, but this time it is Callisto herself who is in danger of betraying her secret:

> heu! quam difficile est crimen non prodere vultu!
> vix oculos attollit humo nec, ut ante solebat,
> iuncta deae lateri nec toto est agmine prima,
> sed silet et laesi dat signa rubore pudoris. (*M*.2.447-450)

The focus here is on Callisto's shame, but the method used to depict this shame is the physical manifestations of shame, see the emphasis on Callisto's face, 'vultu', 'oculos', 'rubore', although there are some mentions of Callisto's behavioural changes, her silence and inability to take her normal place in the goddess' train. But the emphasis, as with much of the *Metamorphoses*' account of Callisto's rape, lies on the physical.

The bath and discovery of Callisto's pregnancy in the *Metamorphoses* is set, explicitly, nine months later, 'orbe resurgebant lunaria cornua nono,/ cum de venatu fraternis languida flammis' (*M*.2.453-454).[128] The reader knows what must be coming next, but to delay this there is a moment of ironic calm, an image of a cool wood, and a murmuring stream:

> nacta nemus gelidum dea, quo cum murmure labens
> ibat et attritas versabat rivus harenas.
> ut loca laudavit, summas pede contigit undas
> his quoque laudatis. (*M*.2.355-458)

The spondees of *M*.2.355 combine with soft, 'm' and 'n' sounds to offer a pleasing approximation of a gently flowing brook. Stillness before a divine epiphany[129] was no novelty, one also finds an example in Callimachus' *Hymn to Athene* 'Τειρεσίας δ' ἔτι μῶνος ἁμᾶ κυσὶν ἄρτι γένεια/ περκάζων ἱερὸν χῶρον ἀνεστρέφετο' (5.75-6). Nevertheless this calm interlude, this delay serves to heighten the dramatic tension of the *Metamorphoses* version. This tension is brought to a peak in the line in which Diana finally declares that they shall bathe, a golden line, 'nuda superfusis tinguamus corpora lymphis!' (*M*.2.459). The poetic tension here echoes that of the dramatic tension.

Inevitably, Callisto's pregnancy is revealed and Diana banishes her from her company. The quality of Diana's anger has been a source of some debate. Johnson believes that in the *Metamorphoses* Diana's anger makes her seem, 'little more than a self-righteous prude' (1996: 16). This thesis disagrees, it is simply more inexplicable (and perhaps consequently more unknowably divine). The comparison of the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* sharpens our appreciation of this: because there is no vow in the *Metamorphoses* version there is no explanation for Diana's behaviour; one is left to infer it from the *Fasti* or simply marvel at her divine majesty. This is also a point when our discussion intersects with the Heinze/Hinds debate about the quality of epic and elegiac anger. It does

---

[128] The reasons for this delay are discussed by Robinson as part of a marrying of the Eratosthenic and Hellenistic traditions (the latter allowing the inclusion of Juno's wrath) (2010: 167 n.156).
[129] Robinson discusses how the rape of Callisto in the *Metamorphoses* and the discovery of her pregnancy in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* are all types of divine epiphany, a motif commonly associated in literature with mid-day (2010: 110 n.163-6).

appear here that Diana's anger follows the general pattern which Hinds noticed in the rapes of Persephone (1987: 106).

We may also consider Diana, and her punishment of Callisto, as part of a wider scheme in both texts. In the *Metamorphoses* one can see that Callisto's banishment, whilst Diana is bathing, prefigures the worse punishment the goddess inflicts on Actaeon when he stumbles upon her bathing (Otis 1970: 117). Otis' 1970 scheme may not receive universal approval but it would be difficult to disagree with his discernment that the *Metamorphoses* moves from a lighter to a darker tone in the first half of the *Metamorphoses.* Callisto is part of an escalating trend of divine vengeance in that text. In the *Fasti*, Callisto is part of a network of rapes and, as we will argue below, also becomes part of the thread of bawdy comedy which runs throughout the text.

We progress now from the first goddess Callisto falls foul of to the second. After Diana banishes her follower, it is Juno's turn to wreak her vengeance. Juno's hate and anger is a very important part of the *Metamorphoses*' version of the story, as we shall see from her actions and speeches. The narrator of the *Metamorphoses* also emphasises Juno's anger, 'quo simul obvertit saevam cum lumine mentem' (*M*.2.470). There are also narratorial references to Juno's anger in the *Fasti*, 'laesa furit Iuno'. (*F*.2.177); 'saevit adhuc canamque rogat Saturnia Tethyn' (*F*.2.191) and critics have noted that revenge is a theme on which the second half of this story circles (Murgatroyd 2005: 72).[130] However Juno's anger takes a lesser role in the *Fasti*, as is particularly evident from a comparison of her speeches.

Juno's speeches are an important expression of her anger in the *Metamorphoses*, much more so than in the *Fasti*. Juno in the *Metamorphoses* has two separate pieces of direct speech; in the *Fasti* only one of these is quoted directly, the other is reported. The first speech Juno makes in the *Metamorphoses* details Juno's intention to punish Callisto by changing her shape:

---

[130] Juno's anger is also the driving force of the *Aeneid*.

> 'scilicet hoc etiam restabat, adultera' dixit,
> 'ut fecunda fores, fieretque iniuria partu
> nota, Iovisque mei testatum dedecus esset.
> haud inpune feres: adimam tibi namque figuram,
> qua tibi, quaque places nostro, inportuna, marito.' (*M*.2.471-475)

This speech is presented as addressed to Callisto, with many second-person addresses, creating an impression of personal attack. Juno characterises Callisto as an adulteress 'adultera', emphasis being provided by naming Jupiter 'marito'. Worst of all, though, Callisto is a fertile adulteress 'fecunda'; here the birth of Arcas seems to be the particular source of Juno's rage.[131] We, who have read the whole of Callisto's rape in the *Metamorphoses,* know that Juno's view is not an accurate one. This perhaps increases the pity one feels for Callisto.

Juno gives a similar speech in the *Fasti*, '"huius in amplexus Iuppiter" inquit "eat"' (*F*.2.180). This speech is extremely brief by any standards, and by comparison with the *Metamorphoses* appears even more so. It is also delayed until after Callisto's transformation into a bear with the result that Juno is reflecting upon an accomplished deed. This lacks some of the dramatic tension of an angry Juno contemplating the prospect of revenge in the *Metamorphoses* version.

Juno's anger does not wane in either version following Callisto's metamorphosis. Indeed Juno's rage ends both versions of the rape of Callisto with a petition to Tethys that Callisto's constellation shall never be allowed to set.[132] However, the two versions are quite strikingly different. In the *Fasti* Juno's approach to Tethys and her request that Callisto's constellation should never set are described in one, final elegiac couplet, 'saevit adhuc canamque rogat Saturnia Tethyn,/ Maenalian tactis ne lavet Arcton aquis' (*F*.191-192). Juno's anger here is muted, there is no direct speech.[133] Too great an emphasis on Juno's anger would distract from the focus on the Diana/ Callisto relationship.

---

[131] Robinson notes that Juno's anger at Callisto's motherhood creates tension with her role as Juno Lucina later in book two (2010: 112 n.177).

[132] That Juno sees catasterism as a reward suggests that she is not the nameless catasteriser in the *Fasti,* as Johnson suggests (1996: 92), rather that that text is downplaying Jupiter's actions.

[133] Although Robinson detects some work being performed by 'saevit', a verb more appropriate to the bear than the goddess (Robinson 2010: 114 n.191).

Reading Juno's speech to Tethys in the *Metamorphoses* in light of that of the *Fasti* emphasises the full-blown nature of this oration. This is the second of Juno's two speeches in the *Metamorphoses* and the largest section of that text's narrative (22 lines out of 135 if one includes the narrator's description of Juno's approach to Tethys - almost one sixth of the entire narrative). As such, we must wonder at the reason for such prominence:

> Intumuit Iuno, postquam inter sidera paelex
> fulsit, et ad canam descendit in aequora Tethyn
> Oceanumque senem, quorum reverentia movit   510
> saepe deos, causamque viae scitantibus infit:
> 'quaeritis, aetheriis quare regina deorum
> sedibus huc adsim? pro me tenet altera caelum!
> mentior, obscurum nisi nox cum fecerit orbem,
> nuper honoratas summo, mea vulnera, caelo   515
> videritis stellas illic, ubi circulus axem
> ultimus extremum spatioque brevissimus ambit.
> et vero quisquam Iunonem laedere nolit
> offensamque tremat, quae prosum sola nocendo?
> o ego quantum egi! quam vasta potentia nostra est!   520
> esse hominem vetui: facta est dea! sic ego poenas
> sontibus inpono, sic est mea magna potestas!
> vindicet antiquam faciem vultusque ferinos
> detrahat, Argolica quod in ante Phoronide fecit
> cur non et pulsa ducit Iunone meoque   525
> collocat in thalamo socerumque Lycaona sumit?
> at vos si laesae tangit contemptus alumnae,
> gurgite caeruleo septem prohibete triones
> sideraque in caelo stupri mercede recepta
> pellite, ne puro tinguatur in aequore paelex!' (*M*.2.508-530)

Murgatroyd feels that this speech, with its over-the-top vengefulness is quite humorous (2005: 248). However Juno's anger is also prominent. The angry, petty Juno integrates this tale more fully with the rest of the *Metamorphoses*. Johnson believes Juno's second speech in the *Metamorphoses* 'disrupts the tale's momentum and its mood' (1996: 15) but this thesis disagrees on two counts. Firstly because this second speech further demonstrates and even enhances the callous cruelty shown by both the husband, Jupiter, and the wife, Juno. Ovid, with his usual lack of restraint, is keen to finish off this tale with an even greater sense of the gods' malice. Secondly because this tale is not an isolated island in the *Metamorphoses*, its momentum and projection into darker, more vengeful

realms suits the general movement of the text. We noted above that Diana's punishment of Callisto in this story was a precursor of Actaeon's punishment (Otis 1970: 387f). Here this thesis believes the sustained malice of Juno prepares us more generally for the darker tone that follows in the *Metamorphoses*.

This speech by Juno, and her first speech, are an important element in the *Metamorphoses* version of Callisto, as one would expect of an epic text. With the differentiation in Juno's anger between the two versions this twice-told tale falls in line with generic categories created by Heinze and refined by Hinds. It does appear that Juno's divine anger, a trait which Hinds associated with the epic version of the rape of Persephone (1987: 106), receives greater prominence in the *Metamorphoses*.

So far, in our discussion, we have skirted around the action that makes Juno so important to this narrative: the metamorphosis. After her husband rapes Callisto, Juno turns her into a bear and, as one might expect, the metamorphosis is much more important to the *Metamorphoses* and is described at some length and in detail:

> dixit et adversam prensis a fronte capillis
> stravit humi pronam. tendebat bracchia supplex:
> bracchia coeperunt nigris horrescere villis
> curvarique manus et aduncos crescere in unguis
> officioque pedum fungi laudataque quondam
> ora Iovi lato fieri deformia rictu.
> neve preces animos et verba precantia flectant,
> posse loqui eripitur: vox iracunda minaxque
> plenaque terroris rauco de gutture fertur; (*M*.2.476-484)

Considerable attention is paid in the *Metamorphoses* to physical detail, for example the repetition of 'bracchia' (*M*.2.477-478) and the ugliness of the bear, 'laudataque quondam/ ora Iovi lato fieri deformia rictu' (*M*.2.480-1). The *Metamorphoses*, which focused on Callisto's appearance before she was raped, continues this interest by describing Callisto's physical changes during the metamorphosis and afterwards by emphasising the monster she has become.

In sharp contrast the *Fasti* glosses over the metamorphosis, 'formam mutatque puellae' (*F*.2.177),[134] signalling the *Fasti*'s lesser interest in this particular point of the narrative, as well as reminding the reader of the *Metamorphoses*' greater treatment of this theme. Here the extreme brevity of the *Fasti* narrative pushes the reader out from this text towards other versions. And as this is a twice-told tale one of the most natural places for the reader to leap is to Ovid's own *Metamorphoses*, which describes Callisto's transformation in much greater detail.

After Callisto's metamorphosis in both texts she wanders, bear-shaped, through the woods in which she once hunted. In the *Metamorphoses* Callisto's internal perspective is here presented:

> a! quotiens, sola non ausa quiescere silva,
> ante domum quondamque suis erravit in agris!
> a! quotiens per saxa canum latratibus acta est
> venatrixque metu venantum territa fugit!
> saepe feris latuit visis, oblita quid esset,
> ursaque conspectos in montibus horruit ursos
> pertimuitque lupos, quamvis pater esset in illis. (*M*.2.489-95)

This internal perspective is shocking and affecting, in the context of such an exploitative text, 'a! quotiens, sola non ausa quiescere silva,/ ante domum quondamque suis erravit in agris' (*M*.2.489-90). The repetition of 'a', both in the important first-word position (*M*.2.489 and 491) adds a greater sense of sorrow to the picture of Callisto's wanderings.[135] In addition to the two 'a's Ovid uses an exclamation 'heu' (*M*.2.447). These exclamations, which Callisto herself is explicitly unable to make, ironically highlight her speechlessness: Callisto's groans (*M*.2.482-3, 486) are contrasted with the freer language of the narrator. This adds a theme of speechlessness to Callisto wanderings.[136]

---

[134] Robinson sees a reminder in this quote of some of the opening words of the *Metamorphoses*, 'mutatas dicere formas (*M*.1.1), again pushing the reader from the *Fasti* to the *Metamorphoses*.
[135] We also find the expression 'a quotiens' in elegy, for example Propertius 3.15.13 (Blunt 1977: 106 n.489).
[136] It is striking that the theme of speechlessness is important to both versions of this metamorphosis. In the *Metamorphoses* metamorphosis the theft of Callisto's human voice is described over three lines (*M*.2.482-484) and particular prominence is awarded to the abominable noise the bear Callisto makes instead of speech (*M*.2.483-4). The speechlessness motif is carried on after the metamorphosis, 'qualescumque manus ad caelum et sidera tollit/ ingratumque Iovem,

I have argued above that Callisto's wanderings are affecting and pathetic, as indeed they are on one level. However the account of Callisto's wanderings is also shot through with subtle dark humour. To have former huntress Callisto hiding from the hunt (*M*.2.491-2) and scared of wild animals (*M*.2.493) is a pathetic picture but also somewhat humorous. Johnson calls the *Metamorphoses*' exploration of Callisto's wanderings a 'genuine empathy…though it is tinged with mannerist wit' (1996: 13-4).[137] In this matter I disagree with Johnson, in that I do not consider this an example of genuine empathy precisely because it is tinged with mannerist wit: the contrast with the humorous elements prevents genuine empathy. What the *Metamorphoses* does is present a voyeuristic glimpse into the torment of a speechless Callisto and prevent this character from achieving true pathos because one is also laughing at her.

In contrast to the *Metamorphoses* (as ever), Callisto's wanderings are given only as a statement of fact in the *Fasti* and condensed to two lines, 'ursa per incultos errabat[138] squalida montes/ quae fuerat summo nuper amata Iovi' (*F*.2.181-2). The only indication of Callisto's physical or mental state is condensed into the word 'squalida', and as such the interpretation of this word becomes important. Although the general meaning of 'rough' would suit the bristly hairs Callisto is now covered with (although *villosus* is more commonly used of shaggy hair (Robinson 2010: 113 n.181)), there is also the implication of dirt and a squalid new life. Ovid himself uses it in this sense at *Amores* 2.2.42, 'squalidus orba fide pectora carcer habet.' Robinson sees a suggestion that Callisto has not washed since she was expelled from Diana's bath (Robinson 2010: 113 n.181); this idea

---

nequeat cum dicere, sentit' (*M*.2.487-8). Callisto's explicit lack of speech is made worse by the remarks which immediately precede it, 'mens antiqua tamen facta quoque mansit in ursa/ adsiduoque suos gemitu testata dolores' (*M*.2.485-6). Callisto has the voice of a bear but she has the mind of woman: she is consciously speechless. This paints a terrible image of a woman trapped in a prison of bear flesh, which is in keeping with the *Metamorphoses*' overall visceral take on the rape of Callisto. Robinson notes that the silencing of Callisto is more explicit in the *Metamorphoses* (*M*.2.482), but that Callisto's silence in the *Fasti* is part of a theme of silence and silencing extremely important to book two of the *Fasti* (Robinson 2010: 114 n.185). Callisto is just one of several *raptae* to be silenced before or after her rape (the others being Lara, Philomela and Lucretia) (Robinson 2010: vii).

[137] Johnson's argument here is not consistent with his views earlier in the paper. He notes how the style of the narration conflicts with the content; although Callisto's internal perspective is present it is 'in some measure subverted by (or better, diluted in) the wit and the sensuous charm which help in representing Jupiter-in-lust' (1996: 12).

[138] *Erro*, also used by the *Metamorphoses* (*M*.2.490), suggests the wanderings of an animal.

has its attractions. If one interprets 'squalida' this way in the *Fasti*, it helps keep the emphasis upon Callisto's relationship with Diana, her dirtiness a perpetual reminder that she was not allowed to bathe. Perhaps most intriguingly of all, this word can be used of someone in mourning, for examples see Ovid again at *M*.15.38.[139] So 'squalida', if one reads beyond the obvious meaning, bristly, brings a small measure of insight into Callisto's physical and possibly mental state. Otherwise there is less dwelling on the bad fortune that has befallen Callisto.[140]

Callisto's metamorphosis and wanderings prepare the ground for her reunion with her son Arcas, and their joint catasterism. Both texts describe the reunion of mother and son during which Arcas, unwitting, meets Callisto and almost shoots her (*M*.2.496-504, *F*.2.183-187). In the *Fasti* their reunion is described over five lines, this being an important part of the *Fasti* version:

> iam tria lustra puer furto conceptus agebat,
>   cum mater nato est obvia facta suo.
> Illa quidem, tamquam cognosceret, adstitit amens
>   et gemuit: gemitus verba parentis erant.
> Hanc puer ignarus iaculo fixisset acuto. (*F*.2.183-190)

Previously we have noted one relationship destroyed in the *Fasti*, that of Diana and Callisto. Now we get to see another: the mother-son relationship destroyed by Callisto's metamorphosis, 'et gemuit: gemitus verba parentis erant' (*F*.2.186). The polyptoton 'gemuit/gemitus' throws extra emphasis onto Callisto's groans, her would-be motherly words. The mother-son relationship that never was is heightened by the use of 'mater' (*F*.2.184) to describe Callisto and 'puer' twice (*F*.2.183, 187) to describe Arcas. The juxtaposition of the words 'mater nato' is also significant; the mother and son are close in the text, for the first time. Robinson also detects an irony here, despite their closeness in the text there is a huge communicative gulf between them (Robinson 2010: 114 n.183-4).

---

[139] Lewis and Short (1979).

[140] Murgatroyd perceives this lack of interest in consequences (both emotional and physical) as part of the *Fasti*'s overall character (2005: 141) and therefore not a trait particular to the rape of Callisto. This is a trait we will continue to see throughout the *Fasti*. It is also important to perceive that this lack of interest in consequences seems to argue against extending Hinds' assertion that there is more lamentation in the *Fasti* Persephone to the rest of the *Fasti*. It is difficult to envision both lack of interest and lamentation being key to the same story.

The reunion of Callisto and Arcas is also important to the *Metamorphoses* though it is treated differently (*M*.2.496-504). The perspective from which the reunion is told is closer to that of Arcas. We hear of his lost mother, 'ecce Lycaoniae proles ignara parentis' (*M*.2.496), of his hunting, 'dumque feras sequitur, dum saltus eligit aptos/ nexilibusque plagis silvas Erymanthidas ambit,' (*M*.2.498-9) and most importantly, the fear which a bear lumbering towards him incites, 'ille refugit/ inmotosque oculos in se sine fine tenentem/ nescius extimuit propiusque accedere aventi/ vulnifico fuerat fixurus pectora telo' (*M*.2.501-504). This all combines to make him less culpable, and more pitiable, in the near matricide. The *Metamorphoses* rape of Callisto seems in this, as in the rest, determined to evoke a powerful emotional response from the reader. Callisto's perspective in this reunion is more briefly mentioned, 'incidit in matrem, quae restitit Arcade viso/ et cognoscenti similis fuit' (*M*.2.500-1). Similarly to the *Fasti,* Callisto is shocked to see her son and then moves towards him. But, unlike the *Fasti,* the Callisto of the *Metamorphoses* does not attempt to speak, does not growl or groan, instead stands speechless. Callisto's speechlessness again continues to be an essential theme of the *Metamorphoses.*

Arcas, terrified in both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* by this monstrous maternal apparition, goes to shoot it. The moment in the *Metamorphoses* is described thus, 'nescius extimuit propiusque accedere aventi/ vulnifico fuerat fixurus pectora telo' (*M*.2.503-4). The near matricide is described more briefly in the *Fasti* version, 'hanc puer ignarus iaculo fixisset acuto' (*F*.2.187). Through this comparison one can see that the *Metamorphoses* includes, as it has throughout this tale, more physical details 'vulnifico', 'pectora', which results in greater impact. Greater impact is also achieved in the *Metamorphoses* because Ovid chooses to end the narrative at this point, in the tension of the moment before a matricide. If one compares this with the almost knockabout finale of the Eratosthenic tradition, with the Arcadians chasing Arcas chasing Callisto into the precinct, one can see that the Ovidian final image packs considerably more punch.

This near matricide prompts the final action of Jupiter in the *Metamorphoses* version of the Callisto myth; the apotheosis of Callisto and Arcas, 'Arcuit omnipotens pariterque ipsosque nefasque/ sustulit et pariter raptos per inania vento/ inposuit caelo vicinaque sidera fecit' (*M*.2.505-7). Jupiter is explicitly the subject of this action and prevents an impious deed from happening. He may not be dignified in the *Metamorphoses*, but he is active. The *Fasti*, as we discussed above, elides Jupiter's role to the extent that he is not even named as the agent of the apotheosis, 'ni foret in superas raptus uterque domos./ signa propinqua micant: prior est, quam dicimus Arcton,/ Arctophylax formam terga sequentis habet' (*F*.2.188-190). Instead the *Fasti* turns to its didactic function, explaining the relation of this myth to the Ursa Major constellation. In both texts the mother/son pair are forced together in horrible celebration of the moment of mother and son reunion and imminent matricide, despite the different methods by which they arrive there.

Through our comparison we have now seen that Callisto is badly treated by the gods in both versions of the text but in different ways.[141] Indeed it is hard to imagine two more opposed treatments of Callisto's metamorphosis than one finds in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*. The *Metamorphoses* is more interested in Callisto's physicality, her appearance, and Jupiter's, Diana's and Juno's actions in the rape, banishment and grotesque metamorphosis. The *Fasti* is less interested in the actions of Jupiter and Juno but focuses instead upon the destruction of the Callisto-Diana relationship and her maternal relationship with her son. Despite the strong differences between the two versions we are invited to read between them with strong verbal echoes, similar plot and one remarkable intertextual moment when Jupiter in the *Metamorphoses* echoes Diana's words from the *Fasti*.

At this point we seem fairly certain of our interpretation of the difference between the two texts: the *Metamorphoses* clearly more visceral, the *Fasti* more pathetic. These distinctions seem to agree broadly with Heinze's distinctions between the two texts. However, we turn now to examine another key

---

[141] Murgatroyd using Gremias' Actant Model to survey the rape of Callisto also notes that Callisto is the Object of five divine Subjects (2005: 154).

distinguisher of genre: *arma*. We find *arma* in the *Metamorphoses* but, as we shall see, they are placed aside. We also find *arma* in the *Fasti* but they are subsumed into a network of obscene puns.

We might, from a generic standpoint, expect more *arma* in the *Metamorphoses* rape of Callisto than the *Fasti*, and indeed this is the case. Callisto, in the *Metamorphoses*, explicitly places aside her weapons before Jupiter rapes her, 'exuit hic umero phaetram lentosque retendit/ arcus inque solo, quod texerat herba, iacebat/ et pictam posita pharetram cervice premebat' (*M*.2.419-421). No mention of Callisto's weapons are made in the *Fasti*, so far so good; generic distinctions remain untroubled and our previous interpretation stands. But when we extend our gaze to look at other weapons in the *Fasti*, then our analysis is turned on its head and we move into the realms of comedy.

Before we examine the *arma* in the *Fasti* let us recap briefly. On the reading of the *Fasti* so far presented, one could view the *Fasti* account in the same light as Johnson does: 'When one ponders the two versions of Callisto's rape,…the dense expressionism of the *Fasti*'s version allow[s] for a more shocking, an uglier, rendition of this rape story… a quick series of unpleasant pictures…There is nothing lovely here, nothing witty; this story, this crabbed, jagged sketch for a story, it is no fun, no fun at all' (1996: 19-20). In addition Murgatroyd although he sees the majority of the *Fasti* rapes as humorous does not include Callisto in these.[142]

However, closer examination of these *arma* undermines the position of Johnson and Murgatroyd. We have already seen that the oath is a central element of the *Fasti* version. Callisto swears, 'illa deae tangens arcus "quos tangimus arcus,/ este meae testes virginitatis" ait'. Unfortunately, at least for the interpretation above, this vow may be riddled with innuendo (Robinson 2010: 108 n.157-8). 'Testes' (*F*.2.158) means 'witness' and although this literal sense of the word is

---

[142] Murgatroyd describes the *Fasti* Callisto as an 'intentionally stark and spare narrative which allows the inherent pathos of the events to come across undiluted' (2005: 247-8). The seven rapes Murgatroyd deems humorous are: Lotis, Omphale, Rhea Silvia, Flora, Cranae and Vesta. 'The humour varies from broad farce to subtle wit' (Murgatroyd 2005: 74). I would argue that Murgatroyd underestimates the prevalence of humour in the rapes; only the rape of Lucretia fails to include at least some comic elements.

never entirely omitted in Classical Latin, it also bears the slang reading of 'testicle'. The word was commonly used in puns, especially those of Roman comedy, 'Caute ut incedas via:/ quod amas amato testibus praesentibus' (Plautus *Curculio* 32-31), 'Si posthac prehendero ego te hic, carebis testibus' (Plautus *Miles Gloriosus* 1426) (Adams 1982: 67).[143] We also find 'arcus' used as 'penis', a typical metaphor drawn from vocabulary of *arma*.[144] The polyptoton on *tango* and the repetition of 'arcus' (*F*.2.157) combine to highlight the coarser possibilities of Ovid's text.[145] This punning has an interesting effect upon Callisto's vow: it will be broken by the very instrument she swears upon and there is an irony in swearing an oath of chastity in these sexual terms.[146] This is how comedy and *arma* intersect in the *Fasti* Callisto; *arma* are subsumed into a network of puns. The *Fasti* although it here engages with *arma* uses them in a non-warlike manner.

There is the possibility of further innuendo in the *Fasti* when Callisto's pregnancy is discovered, 'exuerat tunicas; uteri manifesta tumore,/ proditur indicio ponderis ipsa suo' (*F*.2.171-2). Robinson suggests that we might read a sexual connotation in *indicio ponderis*, for *pondus* as 'penis' see Adams (1982: 71) and Martial 7.35.4 (Robinson 2010: 111 n.172). Diana, when banishing Callisto employs the word 'coetus' see Adams (1982: 178f.) for its sense of sexual intercourse (Robinson 2010: p112 n.173-4). We therefore find innuendo in the *Fasti* is riddled throughout the text.[147]

This use of sexual comedy here in the *Fasti* is intriguing, but it is not the first time instances of sexual comedy have been noted in the *Fasti*. Elaine Fantham's 1983 article was the first to identify and analyse this phenomenon at any length.

---

[143] Katz (1998) explores of the dual meaning of 'testis' and finds the use of testicles in Roman ritual practice to be the explanation, rather than a slangy personification.

[144] As Robinson remarks, there is no evidence that the oath was sworn on the bow of the goddess, prior to the *Fasti* (Robinson 2010: 108 n.157), so Ovid may have introduced this for comic effect.

[145] Robinson (2010: 108 n.157-8) sees the combination of *arcus* and *testes* bring out the innuendo in these words.

[146] Additionally we may perceive a further link with the *Metamorphoses,* 'in the *Metamorphoses* Jupiter-as-Diana was indeed thus armed and equipped with testes' (Robinson 2010: 108-109 n.157-8).

[147] Seeing the comedy in the *Fasti* version also clarifies why there is little exploration of Callisto's character. As the butt of the joke any great emphasis on Callisto's psychology would disturb the balance of the humour. As Murgatroyd says 'where humour was intended we cannot expect to find great psychological realism' (2005: 66).

Fantham's article established that there was a theme of sexual comedy running through the *Fasti*, which Fantham pinpoints as 'frustrated seduction'.[148] Callisto, being as it is an accomplished seduction, is not one of the episodes Fantham surveys. Fantham's definition of the type of comedy in the *Fasti* looks at its thematic applications, 'I use the term comedy here in an unsophisticated sense, to cover popular humour based on amiable trickery, on the frustration of villains, on feasting, drinking and sexual fulfilment' (1983: 187). By the strict letter of this definition Callisto may not count as part of this same type of comedy; there is no amiable trickery, no frustration of villains. There is Jupiter's sexual fulfilment, but this is so elided that it is scarcely possible to rest the entire argument upon that. Nor are there the promise of a good jest[149] or the laughter of the gods as a seal of approval,[150] elements which Fantham also defines as characteristic of the *Fasti*'s comic episodes (1983: 190).

As a further discouragement to viewing the *Fasti* Callisto as one of these comedic episodes Fantham goes on to link most of the comedy found in the *Fasti* not to Olympian gods, but to Dionysus, Silenus and his accompanying satyrs. Fantham argues, 'It is as though Ovid had balanced his scenes from the *praetextae* of Roman legend and prehistory with substantial elements of the satyr play' (187).[151] Barchiesi also believes that Ovid, in a time of Augustan synthesis rediscovered 'this comic dimension, connected with figures and cults that have no political function, or that at least cannot easily be absorbed into the system' (1997: 244). In Callisto's rape, however, Dionysus, Silenus and other satyrs are conspicuous by their absence.

---

[148] Fantham focused upon four episodes of 'frustrated seduction': Priapus' attempted rapes of Lotis and Vesta, (*F*.1.393-440 and *F*.6.321-344 respectively, which we will look at in the section on animal sacrifice), Faunus' attempted rape of Omphale (*F*.2.303-356) and Anna Perenna's failed seduction of Mars (*F*.3.677-696). She also looks briefly at the story of Liber's capture of wild bees (*F*.3.736-762), Romulus' defeat in chasing away the bandits (*F*.2.359-380), and Numa's trickery of Picus and Faunus and then outwitting Jupiter (3.291-360).

[149] A promise of a good jest is a common opening for episodes in the *Fasti* (Murgatroyd 2005: 208).

[150] Gods are not the only ones to have the last laugh in the *Fasti*. There are several episodes which end with laughter at frustrated men. Murgatroyd counts five 1.393ff., 2.305ff., 361ff., 3.677ff., 737ff. (Murgatroyd 2005: 272) if one includes Romulus' laughter at himself after he is beaten back to the food by Remus after chasing bandits. Those episodes that end with roars of laughter are particularly noticeable as they contrast with the general diminuendo endings of tales in the *Fasti* (Murgatroyd 2005: 275).

[151] For an argument that satyr plays were still performed in Ovid's Rome see Wiseman (1988).

However, this thesis would argue that the thread of sexual comedy running through the *Fasti* incorporates more than just drunken revelry. Instead, this thesis wishes to develop Fantham's definition of the comedy in the *Fasti* to include linguistic attributes. Numa and Jupiter engage in word games in the *Fasti* (*F*.2.327-346), and Fantham considers that episode to be one of the comic episodes in the *Fasti*. This thesis considers that although somewhat different to the other comic tales in the *Fasti* the low comedy of the sexual puns in Callisto's vow qualifies this myth for inclusion in the comic thread in the *Fasti*.

Critics until now have had enormous difficulty interpreting the comedic elements of the *Fasti*. Those critics that engage with this element of the *Fasti* have generally viewed these episodes as 'out of place' or posited autobiographical reasons (Ovid's failing libido perchance? (Fantham 1983: 186)). One solution has been to label these stories 'subversive.'[152] Indeed Murgatroyd posits the theory that the rape of Callisto is subversive owing to its placement in the text and presentation of the lustful Jupiter.[153]

This thesis asserts that Ovid principally told the Callisto tale in this fashion to link it to and sustain the thread of broad comedy that weaves throughout the *Fasti*. This broad comedy is part of the *Fasti*'s identity as a text, not as sophisticated or polite as Ovid's Rome, but full of arcane and ludicrous practices. This is how the rape of Callisto intersects with this thesis' argument that the *Fasti* is characterised as a text of flux; a comparison between the twice-told tales of the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* demonstrates that they are both texts that fluctuate in their tone and mood. Here we see a notable difference to the tone and mood we noted in the apotheosis of Romulus. In that twice-told tale both texts included strong epic motifs. In this tale the *Fasti* includes sexual innuendo, which encapsulates flux by being simultaneously tragic and lewd.

The rape of Callisto in the *Fasti* is not alone in using instances of comedy in its narrative to provide tonal variety. As we have already seen there are humorous

---

[152] See (Murgatroyd 2005: 89) who describes them as 'subtly subversive'.
[153] Murgatroyd argues that having identified Augustus with Jupiter (*F*.2.131-2) and commenting on how Augustus' laws keep Roman women chaste (*F*.2.139) to follow this with two examples (Ganymede and Callisto) or Jupiter's lustful behaviour was subversive.

moments in the *Metamorphoses* version of this tale: there is humour in Jupiter's disguise as Diana (*M*.2.425-7) and Callisto hiding from the real Diana (*M*.2.441-446). Ovid also used and then further enhanced Amphis' comic version of the myth, for example, the joke that Jupiter was pleased to be preferred to himself (*M*.2.428-430).

We find comedy in the *Metamorphoses* certainly, but do we find similarly indecent puns? We do and again they are connected with *arma*. For example we noticed above that in the *Metamorphoses* Callisto is described as a warrior of Diana, 'miles erat Phoebes' (*M*.2.415) rather than one of her sacred band, as in the *Fasti*. The next instance of *arma* occurs in the *Metamorphoses* when Ovid uses the word *arcus* again (*M*.2.419), and again we must ask if there is reason to read this word with its slang connotations. In combination with the verb *retendo* (*M*.2.420), *arcus* was commonly used to suggest the state of erection (Adams 1982: 21).[154] But the *Metamorphoses* puts a weight of meaning upon this pun that the more frivolous *Fasti* does not. If we look at the context of this pun we find the *Metamorphoses* using the *arcus/retendo* pun to connect Callisto's disarming and Jupiter's sexual arousal (*M*.2.419-424). In addition the line which describes Callisto lying down to sleep on her discarded quiver 'et pictam posita pharetram cervice premebat' (*M*.2.421) is a particularly poetic line combining interlocked word order (A, B, A, B, verb), with alliteration. The final line of the description of Callisto before Jupiter's intervention is suitably heightened.

The comedy of the *Metamorphoses* is not only darker than that of the *Fasti*, but it is also mixed with a more dramatic narrative. After the rape Callisto nearly forgets her weapons, 'unde pedem referens paene est oblita pharetram/ tollere cum telis et quem suspenderat arcum' (*M*.2.439-440). The weapons that would have helped protect her are now less important to Callisto. But her internal perspective is prevented from reaching pathos by the use of the word 'arcum' (*M*.2.440) at the emphatic last word position. Given that 'arcus' has already been used as a pun only 21 lines earlier the reader may easily make the connection, and, in doing so, rob Callisto's psychological sufferings of dignity.

---

[154] See *Catullus* 80.6 and Horace *Sermones*, 1.2.118 for examples.

Fantham was the first to note a tangible difference between the humour in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*. She describes, 'the treatment [of attempted rape] in the *Fasti* has no parallel in the near-contemporary *Metamorphoses*. Not that the *Metamorphoses* were without episodes of unsuccessful seduction: the extended story of Apollo and Daphne comes early (*M.*1.466-567) and another of Apollo's failures is reported more briefly (*M.*14.132-143) by the Sibyl who resisted his advances. But there is generally a different tone, exemplified by Ovid's sympathetic analysis of Daphne's chastity (*M.*1.474-489) and terror (*M.*1.524-545)' (1983: 186).

It illuminates our understanding of this twice-told tale and the two texts more generally to note that the comedy is of a tangibly different style in each text. Although both contain a thread of comedy Roman and both use puns, the humour of the *Metamorphoses*' Callisto is cruel, ironic and gives a sense of enjoyment and humour gained through deception. The humour of the *Fasti* Callisto is largely to do with puns and the absurdity of Callisto's oath.

In discussions of comedy, particularly the undercutting of *arma* in the *Fasti*, we have touched on generic matters. We will now attempt to further illuminate the insights on genre that can be gained by comparing the two rapes of Callisto. We have seen that the *Metamorphoses* account of the rape of Callisto focuses upon the divine action largely omitted or deflated in the *Fasti*, such as the rape, metamorphosis and catasterism. This conforms to what might be considered traditionally epic in style. We have also noticed that sudden love is demonstrated by Jupiter in the *Metamorphoses*, the moment he sees Callisto he burns with love for her 'in virgine Nonacrina/ haesit, et accepti caluere sub ossibus ignes' (*M.*2.409-410). Diana in the *Metamorphoses* also exhibits sudden anger when she discovers Callisto's pregnancy (*M.*2.464-5); this is even more striking when one contrasts it with the *Fasti,* where one is given insight into Diana's psychology, one understands her feelings of betrayal that prompt the banishment. Sudden emotions were one of Heinze's defining elements of the epic genre.

But there is one respect in which this twin story does not entirely conform to Hinds' generic distinctions. Like the apotheosis of Romulus we find again that it is the *Metamorphoses* which places greater emphasis upon lamentation. The *Metamorphoses* is more explicit about Callisto's grief, 'sensit abesse dolos' (*M*.2.446); 'adsiduoque suos gemitu testata dolores' (*M*.2.486). There are also exclamations of grief in the narration with the repetition of 'a' (*M*.2.489 and *M*.2.491), and 'heu' (*M*.2.447). One might note that this lamentation is associated with Callisto's rape, loss of virginity and loss of Arcas – and not death, nor is Callisto's rape clearly signposted as a pseudo death.[155] Nor is a mood of lamentation sustained throughout the *Metamorphoses* version; rather it is part of the patchwork of the tale, which includes extremely dark comedy. This thesis would suggest that the lamentation in the *Metamorphoses* is not a generic threat but rather contributes to the more emotionally powerful narrative. We have seen throughout that in the *Metamorphoses* we possess a far more intense version of the rape of Callisto; this includes some lamentation.

In conclusion, the *Metamorphoses* provides us with a continuous and compelling narrative that dwells upon the horrific, the sexual, and the blackly humorous, simultaneously enthralling and repulsing the reader. Callisto, in the *Metamorphoses*, is an object to be exploited for Jupiter's pleasure and for that of the reader. Callisto is in equal measures attractive, before and during her rape, and physically repulsive, during and after her metamorphosis. Her gender is an important part of her description and gender play is also part of this narrative with Jupiter's transvestism. The *Fasti*'s account combines farcical humour and innuendo with an emphasis on the relationship between Diana and Callisto. Unlike in the apotheosis of Romulus the *Fasti* is not in this tale challenging its own and the *Metamorphoses*' generic position with the inclusion of strongly epic motifs. Instead, with broad humour and innuendo Callisto's rape becomes part of a theme of sexual comedy which runs throughout the *Fasti*.

---

[155] Hinds identified Persephone's rape as a clearly signalled pseudo death experience (1987: 119).

Chapter Three: The Thrice-Told Europa

Having surveyed the rapes of Callisto we turn now to examine another rape Ovid tells in both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*: the rape of Europa. This rape is only told briefly; indeed this is the briefest of the rapes that Ovid tells in both the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*. The most significant factor about this myth for our discussion is that this is not a twice but a thrice-told tale, told once in the *Fasti* (*F*.5.603-619) and twice in the *Metamorphoses* (*M*.2.833-3.2 & *M*.6.103-107).[156] This offers us the opportunity to compare between the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* but also between the *Metamorphoses* and *Metamorphoses*; in other words we have the opportunity for not only intertextual but also intratextual comparison. This allows us to address the question of whether the difference between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* is Ovidian variation or something more. Can a difference still be distinguished between the two versions in the *Metamorphoses* and the one in the *Fasti*?

We will also compare any difference between the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* versions of Europa's rape to that noted between the rapes of Callisto in the last chapter. Having already surveyed one rape we may hypothesise that this rape will follow a similar pattern: the *Fasti* delivering a bawdy and humorous rape whilst the *Metamorphoses* focuses on the actions of the gods, and on the physical attractiveness and femininity of the *rapta*. To examine this thrice-told tale, and compare it with that of Callisto, this thesis will concentrate on two key elements of Ovid's versions, the presentation of Jupiter and the description of Europa. As there are three texts we will present a close-reading of each in turn and save comparison until the end of the chapter.

The first *Metamorphoses* narrative of the rape of Europa is the fullest account (forty three lines), and told by the Ovidian narrator. Here we find a full narrative that begins with Jupiter instructing Mercury to drive a herd of cows towards the shoreline where Europa plays with her companions. Jupiter transforms himself into a bull and in this form approaches Europa, gains her trust, carries her on his

---

[156] Murgatroyd compares two of the Europas (*M*.2 & *F*.5) (2005: 239-243). He fails to mention the second *Metamorphoses* Europa.

back out to sea. When the bull reaches Crete Jupiter transforms himself back to a god. The other two accounts are much shorter. The *Fasti* account is eighteen lines long and, although it describes Jupiter's disguise as a bull, the focus is upon describing Europa at sea on the bull's back. The second *Metamorphoses* version is only five lines in length and, as part of an ecphrastic description of Arachne's embroidery, focuses entirely on the image of Europa at sea on the bull's back. The rape scene is all but elided in all three versions, although as we shall see, the *Fasti* emphasises the rape the most.

There are many literary and visual sources from which Ovid may have drawn.[157] If we examine the literary sources some of the notable examples are: Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* fragments 19 (Homeric Scholia *Iliad* 12.292) and 19A (Oxyrhynchus Papyri 1358 fr. 1); *Iliad* 14.321; Aeschylus' *Kares* (fr. 99 R); Horace *Odes* (3.27.25-76);[158]*Amores* 1.3.23; Manilius 2.490; Lucian *Dial. Marin* 15.2. Europa's myth appears to have been a popular subject for writers throughout classical antiquity, including those contemporary to Ovid.

One of the most important literary sources of this myth is Moschus' Europa;[159] indeed scholars suggest Ovid made use of this version in his first *Metamorphoses* narrative (Barchiesi 2005: 307 n.836; Otis 1970: 396), whilst other critics have suggested that Ovid also drew on Moschus for his other two versions (Bömer 1986: 431). Written in the second century BC, Moschus' epyllion[160] recounts a similar (but by no means identical) version of Europa's myth to those we find in Ovid. It opens with Europa having a portentous dream (1-27);[161] then follows with descriptions of Europa and her friends (28-36), Europa's basket (37-62), the

---

[157] See Gantz (1993: 210-211) for further on the mythography of the rape of Europa and the *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (1988) for the visual tradition.

[158] Most of the Horatian version revolves around Europa's lamentation. Only one verse coincides with the material of the Ovidian versions: 'Sic et Europe niueum doloso/ credidit tauro latus et scatentem/ beluis pontum mediasque fraudes/ palluit audax'(3.27.25-8). Harrison suggests that Horace's approach to this myth may indicate a tradition or specific 'tragic' Europa, of which we have no other evidence (Harrison 1988).

[159] Hopkinson argues that the Moschan version of the rape of Europa was novel in many ways, including the probable invention of the dream and the decoration on the flower basket (1988: 201).

[160] Campbell describes Moschus' Europa as a 'poem [that] has far more in common with the lighter representations of this genre than with conventional "heroic" epic' (1991: 5).

[161] Hopkinson gives Nausicaa's dream in *Odyssey* 6, Medea's dream in *Argonautica* 3 and *Persae* 181-7 as potential sources for Moschus' dream sequence (1988: 201).

list of flowers (63-71),[162] and the bull (80-88). The bull then takes Europa out to sea (101-115) and the physical appearance of Europa at sea upon the bull's back is described (125-130). Europa laments her fate (131-152), the bull replies (153-161), and rapes her (162-164).

Moschus, like Ovid's three versions of this rape, describes Europa upon the bull's back, holding onto the bull's horn with one hand and with the other lifting her robe out of the water (125-30). The emphasis placed by both Moschus and Ovid on describing Europa on the bull's back suggests a visual tradition of this myth.[163] In examining the surviving visual tradition one finds a wealth of representations of Europa. The *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* records 191 depictions of Europa on or floating beside the bull (1988).[164] We will further explore the visual tradition in our discussions below.

Let us turn now to examine the first time Ovid relates the Europa myth in the *Metamorphoses* (*M*.2.833-3.2). The comparison of Ovid's accounts with Moschus, one of his primary literary sources, provides a useful entry point to this myth. As Otis comments on the *Metamorphoses* book two version, 'No one can prove that Ovid used Moschus, but the descriptions of the bull (Moschus Europa 80-8 and *M*.2.851-8) and of Europa's approach to it (Moschus 89-100, Ovid 858-61) reveal just the likeness and difference we should expect: Ovid never imitates literally' (1970: 395).

One of the most obvious differences between Moschus and the first *Metamorphoses* account is the style of narrative. In Moschus' version we see a

---

[162] Europa's abduction whilst picking flowers, owes a debt to the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, as does the rape of Persephone (Hopkinson 1988: 201).

[163] In light of this Frazer suggests that there may be a famous painting, which Ovid and others are describing (Frazer 1973: 74 n.607). Certainly this thesis agrees that the visual tradition is a very important influence on Ovid's rapes of Europa, given the emphasis awarded to the image of Europa on the bull's back. However, this thesis is not convinced that there was one particular painting responsible, preferring to regard Ovid as influenced by a tradition of paintings. Further argument in support of this position is offered later in this chapter with regard to Europa's hand positions.

[164] Other variations given include the isolated figure, Europa with but not on bull, Europa without bull, Zeus and bull without Europa.

narrative composed of what Otis calls 'static windows' (1970: 396);[165] that is to say the description of moments rather than a continuous narrative. As Otis also notes, the most striking thing one notices, when comparing Moschus to Ovid, is that the windows of the Moschus version become in Ovid's hands a smooth and compelling narrative (Otis 1970: 396).[166] Otis refers here, to the version in *Metamorphoses* book two but the other two versions told by Ovid, as we will see, present less in the way of a continuous narrative and are more in the style of a Moschan 'window'.[167]

Central to the first *Metamorphoses* narrative is Jupiter's desire for Europa, his plan to hide amongst a herd of cows, and his disguise as a bull. If we compare the presentation of Jupiter in Moschus and the first *Metamorphoses* account it gives an interesting insight into the Ovidian version. Moschus prefers to emphasise the dignity and godlike appearance of the bull, noting that this bull was not the type employed in farming work (80-88), and that ox was divinely sweet smelling, (89-92). It was Otis' opinion that Ovid drew most heavily on Moschus' descriptions of the bull and Europa's approach to it in his own version (1970: 395).[168] A description of this kind would be most fitting for an epic version of this myth.

---

[165] Although it must be noted that some of the components of Moschus' *Europa* seem not to fit perfectly the 'static window' definition. The dream (1-14) seems less like a 'static window', it has action, in the guise of speech, and development in that Europa learns her fate, albeit in a riddled manner. There is also Europa's speech to herself on waking from this dream, which also includes (emotional) movement; Europa talks herself from terror to a hope that the portents will turn out well (15-27). The conversation between Europa and Jupiter is also full of narrative development (131-161).

[166] Otis also suggests that Moschus' tale lacks the 'empathy' of Ovid's (1970: 395-6), although 'empathy' would not be the word employed by this thesis to describe the first *Metamorphoses* narrative. Rather, as we shall examine, we are allowed insight into Jupiter's internal perspective; this is not the same as 'empathy'.

[167] Heinze had a generic explanation for the windows as descriptive rather than narrative writing, which he saw as an attribute of elegiac writing. We can see that the first *Metamorphoses* version has far and away the most convincing narrative of the three accounts and that the other two versions, the *Fasti* and the second *Metamorphoses*, do present a far more static, descriptive picture. Therefore either Heinze was incorrect or the second *Metamorphoses* version of Europa's myth is challenging its own genre. However ecphrastic descriptions, as which we could describe Arachne's weaving, were a feature of epic poetry.

[168] However, Otis does not expand to elucidate how Ovid uses Moschus at these points.

When we examine the characterisation of Jupiter, in the first *Metamorphoses* version, we find that Ovid does describe the beautiful appearance of the bull. A full description is given:

> colla toris exstant, armis palearia pendent,
> cornua parva quidem, sed quae contendere possis
> facta manu, puraque magis perlucida gemma.
> nullae in fronte minae, nec formidabile lumen:
> pacem vultus habet. (*M*.2.854-858)

However, the very fulsome praise may suggest that the bull is being mocked. Indeed the ridiculousness of Jupiter's disguise as a bull and his undignified behaviour provoked by his amour for Europa become more fully developed. There is repeated emphasis on Jupiter's new food, 'mox adit et flores ad candida porrigit ora' (*M*.2.861); 'et nunc adludit viridique exsultat in herba' (*M*.2.864), plus a description of Jove, as bull, gamboling (*M*.2.864). We even hear Jupiter moo, 'induitur faciem tauri mixtusque iuvencis/ mugit' (*M*.2.850-1), and the delay of 'mugit' by enjambment only serves to heighten the humorous effect. This description of Jupiter as bull is quite different in emphasis to the Moschus version. Indeed Otis himself notes that 'Ovid's emphasis, unlike that of Moschus, is on Jupiter, on the incongruity of his disguise (846ff.) and on his amorous feelings (862ff.)' (1970: 395). Ovid may make use of Moschus and may, as Otis suggests, draw heavily on the Moschan source, but he adapts this to suit his own purposes.

In addition, not content with merely showing the humorous physical aspects of Jupiter as a bull, Ovid's narrative allows us access to Jupiter's internal perspective. This is a perspective entirely dominated with desire for Europa, as repeated diction demonstrates. 'Vix' is repeated twice, 'vix iam, vix cetera differt' (*M*.2.863), to highlight the struggle Jupiter is having to control himself. This is followed by another repetition, this time of 'nunc', ' et nunc adludit viridique exsultat in herba,/ nunc latus in fulvis niveum deponit harenis' (*M*.2.864-5). In this same quote there is also a sense of Jupiter's giddy joy, enhanced by three verbs used in these two lines, 'adludit', 'exsultat', and

'deponit'; all in the historic present tense for immediacy. It is this desire which has led to Jupiter's ridiculous transformation and his humorous antics as a bull.

Access to Jupiter's internal perspective and the motivation for his ludicrous behaviour is important as it demonstrates the truth of the narrator's statement:

> non bene conveniunt nec in una sede morantur
> maiestas et amor; sceptri gravitate relicta
> ille pater rectorque deum, cui dextra trisulcis
> ignibus armata est, qui nutu concutit orbem,
> induitur faciem tauri mixtusque iuvencis
> mugit et in teneris formosus obambulat herbis. (*M*.2.846-51)

Jupiter quite literally lays aside his sceptre and his dignity to behave in an absurd manner. Ovid uses Jupiter's *sceptrum* here in both the literal and figurative sense, of the actual sceptre and of the rule of his kingdom. This adds to the general emphasis on the grandness of Jupiter, 'ille pater rectorque deum', whose actions are so potent for mankind 'qui nutu concutit orbem', in order that the simple statement 'induitur faciem tauri' should seem all the more incongruous and humorous. Indeed the narrator's comment which opens the above quote 'non bene conveniunt nec in una sede morantur/ maiestas et amor' sums the matter up nicely. Ovid even delays the two key words, majesty and love, by enjambment so they pack a more effective punch. As Otis sees it, and as this thesis also argues, 'Jupiter has now given up all his dignity' (1970: 341).

Jupiter's disguise as a bull in this narrative gains an extra nuance when seen in the context of his other rapes in the *Metamorphoses*. Previous to Europa in the *Metamorphoses*, Jupiter has raped Io (*M*.1.568-750) in which he didn't disguise himself at all, merely his actions, 'Interea medios Iuno despexit in Argos/ et noctis faciem nebulas fecisse volucres/ sub nitido mirata die' (*M*.1.601-3). In the rape of Callisto he disguises himself as the goddess Diana, as we have seen. Now in Europa's rape Jupiter has disguised himself as a bull and here the joke is on Jupiter. We can note a decreasing level of dignity in Jupiter's disguises as the *Metamorphoses* progresses. Otis explains this lack of dignified behaviour by seeing the Europa myth as the finale of the *amores* of Jupiter and Apollo (1970: see esp. pages 92, 84 and 121-2). In his view, the narrator's comment 'non bene

conveniunt nec in una sede morantur/ maiestas et amor' (*M*.2.846-7) is a summary of these love affairs (1970: 122).[169] Barchiesi also sees Europa's rape as part of a sequence of light, comic rapes that dominate the opening books of the *Metamorphoses* (Barchiesi 2005: 307 n.836).[170]

If we examine Jupiter's transformation in the context of the other twice-told rapes in the *Metamorphoses* we can note that the quality in humour in this twice-told tale is nothing like that in the rape of Callisto. There the comedy was dark, cruel and mostly at Callisto's expense. Here the comedy is connected with Jupiter, his appearance and behaviour as a bull. We may also notice a continued interest in physicality in this rape. However, rather than the focus on Callisto's attractiveness and grotesque metamorphosis we have instead a focus on Jupiter's transformation and the comedy of his new physical appearance and mannerisms.

Another method of interpreting Jupiter's disguise as a bull is on a generic level. Jupiter's laying aside of his sceptre might be interpreted as a rejection (on his behalf and that of the *Metamorphoses*) of conventional epic norms. It is reminiscent of Mars' laying aside of weapons in the apotheosis of Romulus, and we noted there the potential for generic disruption. Jupiter's laying aside of his sceptre and dignity could potentially be interpreted as a rejection of epic grandeur in the *Metamorphoses*. We might find further grounds for generic interpretation when the bull is described, 'quod proelia nulla minetur' (*M*.2.859). Here Jupiter, in his guise as a bull, offers no threat of battle. We may argue that the *Metamorphoses* here deliberately challenges its epic status. Otis goes as far as to say 'The [*Metamorphoses* book two version of] Europa is not epic at all' (1970: 117-8). Whilst acknowledging that the *Metamorphoses* here is

---

[169] Otis also considers Europa to be the culmination of Jupiter and Apollo's love affairs in the *Metamorphoses*. In Otis' opinion Europa is the bridge to the next section of the *Metamorphoses* 'The Avenging Gods' (1970: 128). Even the fiercest critics of Otis' scheme would be hard pressed to argue against the gradual darkening of the initially more light-hearted tone of the *Metamorphoses*. But this thesis would not agree that vengeful gods are saved exclusively for after the Europa myth, Mercury's punishment of Aglauros, which immediately precedes Europa, is vengeful in tone, especially if one notes the description of Envy filling Aglauros' heart with thorns. The concluding remark also charts more divine retribution meted out, 'Has ubi verborum poenas mentisque profanae/ cepit Atlantiades' (*M*.2.833-4).

[170] Barchiesi also notes Ovid's focus on the sensational, the spectacular in his manipulation of the Europa myth (and the other rapes in the *Metamorphoses*) (Barchiesi 2005: 308 n.836).

challenging its genre, the focus is still very much on the divine action, this important demarcation of epic texts.[171]

This focus on divine action, particularly Jupiter's ridiculous disguise and behaviour is such that it leaves little room in the first *Metamorphoses* account for description of Europa. She is described, at the shore, 'ubi magni filia regis/ ludere virginibus Tyriis comitata solebat' (2.844-845). Here Europa is described principally by her relation to other things, her relation to her father the king and in relation to the shoreline on which she plays.

Where there is characterisation of Europa it is related to her reaction to the bull. She approaches the bull, 'miratur Agenore nata,/ quod tam formosus, quod proelia nulla minetur;/ sed quamvis mitem metuit contingere primo;/ mox adit et flores ad candida porrigit ora' (*M*.2.858-61) and Europa is characterised as initially fearful but then trusting, although the focus is still upon Jupiter. When she is seated upon the bull and the bull begins to run she is again fearful, 'pavet haec litusque ablata relictum/ respicit' (*M*.2.873-4). Europa is little characterised, and what characterisation there is shows her only as fearful in this version of her rape. The emphasis remains upon Jupiter's ridiculous disguise, and the humorous incongruity of the king of gods mooing and eating grass.

The image of Europa upon the bull's back, this quintessential part of the myth, which we find so frequently in the visual tradition is described in three lines, 'pavet haec litusque ablata relictum/ respicit et dextra cornum tenet, altera dorso/ inposita est; tremulae sinuantur flamine vestes' (*M*.2.873-5). The description of Europa upon the bull's back in the first *Metamorphoses* version is brief compared with the overall length of the passage, showing the *Metamorphoses*' greater interest in the actions of Jupiter.

It is also interesting that in this thrice-told tale, the *Metamorphoses* puts little emphasis upon the physical appearance of the *rapta*. Here we can see Europa's

---

[171] The end of *Iliad* book one features Zeus and Hera quarrelling (525ff.) and in the *Odyssey* there is the capture of Mars and Venus (8.266-369). Both are examples of ridiculous divine behaviour within epic texts.

clothes flutter, but nothing is mentioned of her beauty. Instead the description of the bull on the shore, and Europa's approach to it, is full of physicality, with references to hands, lips, patting and other physical actions: 'candida ora' (*M*.2.861), 'oscula dat manibus' (*M*.2.863), 'pectora' (*M*.2.866), 'virginea plaudenda manu' (*M*.2.867).[172] However these references describe Jupiter or Europa's contact with the bull, not Europa herself. Where we found an emphasis on Callisto's appearance and gender in the rape of Callisto, we find an emphasis on Jupiter's disguise in Europa's rape.

But as noted above *Metamorphoses* book two is not the only moment in the *Metamorphoses* when the myth of Europa is narrated; intriguingly there is a second version of the Europa myth, told very briefly in *Metamorphoses* book six. Perhaps we will find that this rape of Europa has more in common with the rape of Callisto in the same text.

Told as part of the myth of Arachne, this rape of Europa is only five lines in length. Having challenged the goddess Minerva to a weaving competition, Arachne produces a tapestry depicting various misdeeds of the gods, including the rape of Europa. In this way Europa's rape is told again in the *Metamorphoses* as an ecphrastic description:

> Maeonis elusam designat imagine tauri
> Europam: verum taurum, freta vera putares;
> ipsa videbatur terras spectare relictas
> et comites clamare suas tactumque vereri
> adsilientis aquae timidasque reducere plantas. (*M*.6.103-7)

This version of the Europa myth does not have a narrative in the same sense as Ovid's first *Metamorphoses* version. It does not narrate or describe Jove's transformation to a bull or Europa climbing upon it. It also resembles rapes in the *Fasti* in that, (with the exception of Sextus in the Lucretia narrative); it focuses very little on the rapist. Rather it focuses upon one image, Europa out at sea on a

---

[172] Campbell reads the Moschan account of Europa's interactions with the bull as 'suggestive of [Europa's] desire for sexual gratification' (1991: 7). In the Ovidian account the emphasis is upon Jupiter's sexual desire, but Ovid may be developing the Moschan account with this emphasis we have noted upon touch and physicality.

bull. This single image is reminiscent of the 'windows' of Moschus' account. It does in fact strongly resemble the version in Moschus; both describe Europa, on the bull's back, calling to her friends *M*.6.106; Moschus 2.111-12. Their location is not identical, in Ovid's version Europa is already out to sea, whereas in Moschus the bull is still heading for the shoreline. This is Ovid interacting with yet developing his source material.

The focus of this account, appropriately for a litany of divine misbehaviour, is not on the humorous aspects of Jupiter's disguise as a bull, but rather, to the exclusion of everything else, upon the image of Europa, afraid, upon the bull's back. Indeed the emphasis is put squarely upon the god's deception with the polyptoton of 'verus', and the use of 'elusam'. Also, although on a literal level 'verum taurum, freta vera putares' (*M*.6.104) is referring to the skill of Arachne's work – and could be translated 'you would think it real', it could also be referring to the story – 'you (the reader) would have thought the bull to be a real bull'. Thus the audience becomes also a 'victim' of the deception, which must lead the reader to empathise on some level more with Europa. Where the first *Metamorphoses* Europa focuses upon Jupiter, the second *Metamorphoses* Europa prefers to focus upon Europa and her deception. However, despite the focus on Europa this is a markedly different rape to that of Callisto. There is no emphasis on Europa's attractiveness, no rape scene, and rather than humour at the deception of the *rapta* there is instead a portrait of Europa's fear and deception.

The version of Europa in *Metamorphoses* book six may also have a meta-textual angle. The potential parallel between Ovid and Arachne is one noted in scholarship; both are 'weaving' this story.[173] This reading may be reinforced by the naming of Arachne as 'Maeonis', an interesting appellation given the common 'Maeonides' for Homer. It is also significant that both Ovid and Arachne tell the same story, Europa's rape. This was not an inescapable necessity; there are many stories of divine misbehaviour that Arachne could have chosen to depict. By narrating an identical tale Arachne and Ovid are aligned closer. Indeed if we read between the two *Metamorphoses* accounts we may find

---

[173] For a recent discussion of weaving as a metaphor for poetic activity see Rosati's article (1999).

further intratextual impetus. If we return to a passage from the first
Metamorphoses version of Europa's rape we find that Jupiter's bull is described
as a work of art 'sed quae contendere possis/ facta manu' (*M*.2.855-6). This
could be read as a reference to the varied visual tradition, as we have seen
Europa and the bull appears to have been a widespread image. This could also
refer to the bull created by Arachne, a bull depicted so well you would think it
real. Here there is a real bull so wonderful you would think it a work of art. Here
again we may detect pull between the two accounts.

We move now to examine the *Fasti* version. The justification for telling the
Europa myth here in the *Fasti* lies in its aetiological function to explain the
constellation of the Hyades, a star cluster which appears in the constellation
Taurus. The aetiological impetus for the tale's narration is declared in the first
couplet of the tale and also the last, to create a ring structure, as is standard in the
Fasti, 'Idibus ora prior stellantia tollere Taurum/ indicat. Huic signo fabula nota
subest' (*F*.5.603-4).[174] Therefore Europa, like Callisto, is one of the *Fasti*'s star
myths. The Europa story also explains the naming of the continent Europe,
'parsque tuum terrae tertia nomen habet' (*F*.5.618).[175] This emphasis upon
Europa giving her name to Europe is absent from both the *Metamorphoses*
accounts, despite their difference of approach to the myth. This is one way in
which the *Fasti* differentiates itself from both versions of the rape of Europa in
the *Metamorphoses*.

However, Ovid still delivers a tale distinct in character from his other two
versions, and from Moschus. To demonstrate this point let us look at the opening
of the narrative 'praebuit, ut taurus, Tyriae sua terga puellae/ Iuppiter et falsa

---

[174] Although as Murgatroyd (2005: 240) notes this *aition* is immediately undercut by Ino as an
additional explanation. This is in keeping with the mood of playful and questioning didacticism
that the rest of the *Fasti* portrays.
[175] The aetiological emphasis of Europa's rape in the *Fasti,* the naming of the continent, leads one
feminist theorist to argue that by stressing the outcome of Europa's rape the emphasis of the rape
is on its positive outcome (Europa gives her name to a continent) (Richlin 1992: 169). Richlin
herself only points to three of the *Fasti*'s rapes as having 'positive' outcomes; Chloris and Crane,
as well as Europa, 'Common elements are the powerlessness of the women and the potential for
unlocking that results from their penetration; hence the catalytic function of the historical
women' (Richlin 1992: 169). In the same book Joshel offers one definition of historical woman
'as space, making her a catalyst for male action. She embodies the space of home, a boundary,
and a buffer zone. She is also a blank space' (Joshel 1992: 121).

cornua fronte tulit' (*F*.5.605-6). We see that the *Fasti*, like the second version of the rape of Europa, does not dwell upon Jupiter's transformation. Indeed the *Fasti* narrative commences at a much later point in the story (Murgatroyd 2005: 240). All that is offered on the subject of Jupiter's disguise is condensed into these two lines. However Ovid still heightens these two lines with verbal effects. The identity of the bull, is delayed to the second line of this couplet with the result that, not only does the name Jupiter occupy the important first-word position of that line but the verbal patterning echoes the narrative pattern of the discovery of the bull's real identity: the bull's identity revealed last of all. There is also strong alliteration on *taurus*, *Tyriae, terga* and *tulit* and *falsa fronte,* the words which encapsulate the important elements of this myth. Verbal effects, precisely because this is such a well-known tale in antiquity, become part of the important *varatio* in this version.

Rather than focus, like the first *Metamorphoses* account, on Jupiter's disguise the *Fasti*, like the second *Metamorphoses* version, focuses upon the image of Europa upon the bull's back.[176] However, it achieves an entirely different effect. One of the key threads of the *Fasti*'s description of Europa upon the bull's back is the focus upon her appearance. Europa's appearance is described as suitable for Jupiter 'Sidoni, sic fueras aspicienda Iovi' (*F*.5.610), which is high praise indeed. Another example is the description of the action of the breeze upon Europa, 'aura sinus implet, flavos movet aura capillos:/ Sidoni' (*F*.5.609-10). This line is very soft and sensuous – filled with the alliteration and assonance of 'a', 's' and 'm' sounds, all of which combine with the sense of the words to highlight Europa's sensuous appearance. Europa herself also seems focused upon her own appearance, she is inappropriately concerned about her dress getting wet, when she should be more concerned about the bull (Murgatroyd 2005: 241).[177] The

---

[176] We might observe, with Murgatroyd, that the majority of the *Fasti* narratives do not appear to be character-driven (2005: 142). This is certainly in evidence in the myth of Europa. Where the *Metamorphoses* focuses upon characterising the ludicrous Jupiter, the *Fasti* instead focuses upon one single image and neither party is much characterised, excepting that Europa is silly enough to fear the waves, not the bull, which creates humour.

[177] Murgatroyd believes the *Fasti* account builds upon Moschus' description of Europa, particularly her concern for her dress when perched on the bull at sea. Indeed Murgatroyd argues that Ovid engages more closely with Moschus in the *Fasti*'s description of Europa upon the bull's back than in the *Metamorphoses* (2005: 241).

Fasti also describes Europa's fear, and the attractiveness of this fear, 'et timor ipse novi causa decoris erat' (*F*.5.608).

The actual rape of Europa is dispatched in four words, 'te, Sidoni, Iuppiter implet' (*F*.5.617); the rape of Callisto is similarly elided in the *Fasti* version. Another similarity between the *Fasti*'s rape scene in Callisto and Europa emerges; Europa's rape also employs innuendo and humour:

> Idibus ora prior stellantia tollere Taurum
> > indicat: huic signo fabula nota subest.
> praebuit ut taurus Tyriae sua terga puellae
> > Iuppiter et falsa cornua fronte tulit,
> illa iubam dextra, laeva retinebat amictus,
> > et timor ipse novi causa decoris erat;
> aura sinus implet, flavos movet aura capillos:
> > Sidoni, sic fueras aspicienda Iovi.
> saepe puellares subduxit ab aequore plantas,
> > et metuit tactus adsilientis aquae;
> saepe deus prudens tergum demisit in undas,
> > haereat ut collo fortius illa suo.
> litoribus tactis stabat sine cornibus ullis
> > Iuppiter inque deum de bove versus erat.
> taurus init caelum: te, Sidoni, Iuppiter implet,
> > parsque tuum terrae tertia nomen habet.   (*F*.5.603-618)

Murgatroyd notes that the verb *impleo* means not only 'made pregnant' but 'also seems to contain a graphic double entendre' (2005: 69). The word order is also suggestive; we might wonder whether *init* will govern *te*. This tone continues to follow a pattern established in Callisto: the rape scene is almost entirely elided and the story overall is humorous, bawdy with little psychological investigation. The rape of Europa in the *Fasti* has also, like Callisto, not previously been thought part of the thread of sexual comedy which runs through the *Fasti*. This thesis would argue that it is, for the same reasons as the rape of Callisto, because of the sexual innuendo and word play. Here again we argue that sexual comedy in the *Fasti* is a much more pervasive theme than has previously been noted; both the *Fasti* versions of the rapes of Europa and Callisto locate themselves amongst the thread of sexual comedy that weaves itself through the *Fasti*.

Another moment of levity is produced in the *Fasti* version with the description of Jupiter deliberately plunging into the sea to increase Europa's fear and make her cling tighter, 'saepe deus prudens tergum demisit in undas' (*F*.5 613). The word 'prudens' used in this context is also somewhat humorous by its incongruity, used here for Jupiter's tactics in his love affair. The word is often found in more elevated contexts for example, 'prudens in iure civili' Cicero *Lael*. 2.6. Murgatroyd also noted that Ovid made a joke out of Europa's fear and linked it with the *Fasti*'s general lack of concern with the psychology of the rape victim (2005: 64).

We have now looked at all three of Ovid's versions of the rape of Europa and found three quite strikingly different accounts. We turn now to look at some points which arise in their comparison. The version in *Metamorphoses* book two is light, humorous,[178] with an emphasis upon the god, Jupiter. Conversely the version in *Metamorphoses* book six is shorter, and with an emphasis on Europa's deception by Jupiter. Both contain a description of Europa out to sea on the back of the bull. Neither shares a noticeable similarity with the *Metamorphoses* version of the rape of Callisto. However both versions in the *Metamorphoses* focus upon the effect of the god's actions (a ridiculous transformation in book two and deceiving Europa in book six).

In the *Fasti* however the focus is firmly upon Europa; Jupiter, although present, is not the focus of the narrative. This distinction is similar to that we noticed between the two Romulean apotheoses and the rapes of Callisto, there divine action was also much more prominent in the *Metamorphoses*, the human perspective more important to the *Fasti*. It is interesting to note that we are still able to detect a difference between the two *Metamorphoses* accounts and the *Fasti* that spans across three twice-told tales.

While on one hand playing down the divine action, the *Fasti* also highlights Europa's attractiveness and employs innuendo, unlike either of the

---

[178] A difference in humour is, arguably, detectable, between the versions of the rape in *Metamorphoses* book two and *Fasti*. Murgatroyd calls the humour of the *Metamorphoses* more 'diffuse and leisurely' (2005: 241) than that of the *Fasti*. Here this thesis does not agree with him; it is possible to describe the *Metamorphoses* as leisurely simply by virtue of being longer.

Metamorphoses accounts. Here Ovid may be following Moschus, when the earlier poet hints at the attractiveness of the image of Europa at sea upon the back of the bull (2.130). This is intriguing, because in the other twice-told rape we have examined, the rape of Callisto, we saw a much greater emphasis on the attractiveness of Callisto in the *Metamorphoses* version. Attractiveness of the rape victim is therefore not a consistent difference between Ovid's twice (or thrice) told tales.[179]

If we turn to the rape scene there is a surprising result: the rape, although brief in the *Fasti*, is actually the most detailed of all three of Ovid's accounts. Europa's rape is actually entirely absent from the second *Metamorphoses* version, and merely alluded to in the first *Metamorphoses*, 'Iamque deus posita fallacis imagine tauri/ se confessus erat Dictaeaque rura tenebat' (*M*.3.1-2). Murgatroyd calls the end of the Europa tale in the *Metamorphoses* 'teasingly unsatisfying' with the rape elided (Murgatroyd 2005: 240).[180] Instead in the *Fasti*, although the rape is not emphasised, we have bald and graphic innuendo. This also marks a distinction between the *Fasti* and the two versions of the rape in the *Metamorphoses*.

The varying length of the tales is another obvious difference between the three. The differing lengths do, more generally, introduce variation between the three versions of this tale. Murgatroyd asserts that shortness of the *Fasti*'s rape of Europa was part of variety which Ovid puts into the various rape narratives in the *Fasti* (2005: 81) and a similar interpretation could stand for the second *Metamorphoses* version of the rape of Europa. In addition, the highly compact version in *Metamorphoses* book six and the relatively brief *Fasti* version promote an intra/intertextual reading, as we will see.

---

[179] The *Fasti*, by emphasising Europa's attractiveness, presents Europa as an object for the male gaze. This gaze was an important element in our dissection of Callisto's rape in the *Metamorphoses*, 'The determining male gaze projects its phantasy on to the female form which is styled accordingly' (Mulvey 1975: 11).

[180] This is similar to the trick we saw played on the reader in the *Fasti* version of the rape of Callisto, when the reader was lured into an expectation of the rape only to find it had already happened. Both the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* frustrate the reader's expectation of a rape scene.

We noted that all three Ovidian versions give a description of Europa seated upon the back of the bull. Although Ovid's versions all present quite a different slant, such as the focus on attractiveness in the *Fasti*, it is also a moment of proximity between the three accounts. Let us now compare this point of similarity. The image of Europa seated upon the bull encompasses the whole of Arachne's picture (*M*.6.103-107) and all but eight lines of the *Fasti* version (*F*.5.607-614). The first *Metamorphoses* version of the rape dwells the least on this image although it still describes it briefly (*M*.2.873-875).

There is an intriguing example of diction shared between the *Fasti* version and the second *Metamorphoses* version. A description of Europa, fearful, withdrawing her feet from the sea occurs at 'saepe puellares subduxit ab aequore plantas/ et metuit tactus assilientis aquae' (*F*.5.611-12) and 'et comites clamare suas tactumque vereri/ adsilientis aquae timidasque reducere plantas' (*M*.6.106-7). The similarity in diction, especially as regards *assilientis, aquae* and *plantas* is very striking, and may prompt the reader to remember Ovid's other version. It is especially interesting that this similarity in diction occurs between the *Fasti* and the second *Metamorphoses* version of Europa, the emphasis on Europa's fear fits well, but with different interpretations into both these texts (the second *Metamorphoses* focusing on the misdeeds of the gods regarding Europa, the *Fasti* focusing on the attractiveness of this fear and an ironic humour generated for the reader that it should be the bull that she fears not the water).

There is one more instance of not shared, but deliberately different, diction that creates further invitation to compare this thrice-told tale. If one examines Europa's hands in Ovid's versions one finds that Ovid is very specific in his description in the *Fasti* and the first *Metamorphoses* account, 'illa iubam dextra, laeva retinebat amictus' (*F*.5.607), 'respicit et dextra cornum tenet, altera dorso/ inposita est;' (*M*.2.874-5). The specificity of the description is intriguing. There was considerable variety with regard to Europa's exact position on the bull in the visual tradition.

If we examine just a few of the many depictions of Europa in various attitudes, there is one surviving fresco from Pompeii (Museo Archeologico Nazionale di

Napoli (inv. nr. 111475), Casa di Giasone) which depicts Europa on the bull on dry land, her left hand resting on the bull's mane, her right near her head. The Tarquinia Museum houses a red-figure Stamnos from the 5th Century BC, which depicts Europa behind the bull, grasping its horn in her right hand. The British Museum houses a white glass paste gem, dated 27-14BC, engraved with Europa clinging to the bull, her left hand again near her head, her right unseen.

Visual depictions of Europa also commonly feature her with her mantle in arc. However the *LIMC* rarely specifies which hand holds the mantle, or what her other hand is doing. In one instance, no. 140 (Pompeii VIII 2 38-39 RM.2, 1887, 15 no.3. Schefold, WP 217 (c.)) it records the right hand trailing the mantle. However it also supplies an illustration of this image, in which it is the left hand that is trailing the mantle, the right is holding onto the bull's ear. This inaccuracy may make reliance upon its other, non-illustrated entries less attractive. Even without this precision of detail, it can still be said that there was, in the visual tradition, considerable variety in Europa's attitude and hand position.

We also find a difference between Europa's hand position in the first *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* accounts of her rape. Europa's overall position is roughly similar yet the precise positioning of the hands is different. In the *Fasti* Europa is holding the bull's mane in her right hand, her dress in her left. This is the closest to the positioning of Europa's hands in the Moschus version (Murgatroyd 2005: 241). In the *Metamorphoses* she holds the bull's horn with her right hand and the left rests upon the bull's back. This could be explained by typical Ovidian variation. However the position of the left hand holding (protecting?) her dress in the *Fasti* characterises Europa differently to just having a hand resting upon the bull's back, as in the *Metamorphoses* (that is, the Europa of the *Fasti* is comically concerned with her appearance). This 'spot the difference' game is highly Ovidian and invites us to notice the variation between these different accounts.

Reading Ovid's thrice-told rape of Europa has been a useful intra/intertextual study. Despite the brevity of these tales we were able to see that an interest in

divine action was restricted to the two *Metamorphoses* accounts, whilst the *Fasti* preferred to focus upon Europa. This is in keeping with the difference we noticed in Ovid's two rapes of Callisto, the *Metamorphoses* there also more interested in the divine. We also find that sexual innuendo is another trait shared by both Callisto and Europa's rapes in the *Fasti*. The thread of sexual comedy in that text has been shown to be more prevalent than previously thought. We have also seen that the rapes of Europa engage in a 'spot the difference' game in relation to Europa's hand positions when seated upon the bull. Ovid engages in an intertextual game to entertain the reader. Comparison has also shown us that the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* are not consistent in focusing upon the attractiveness of the *raptae* or the rape scene. Here the texts are more flexible and more various in their approach to rape narratives. This links to this thesis' wider argument that both the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* are texts of flux, that they continually negotiate and renegotiate both their individual identity and their relationship to one another.

Chapter Four: Hippolytus, The Twice-Told Man

We turn now to the twice-told tale of Hippolytus, his exile and death. We find that Hippolytus has two names, and it seems appropriate for a twice-told man that his second name Virbius was thought to derive from *vir bis*.[181] This is an intriguing twice-told tale because of the multiplicity of intertexts not just between the two Ovidian accounts[182] but also because of their relationship to a third text, Virgil's *Aeneid*. The focus of this chapter will be upon exploring these intertexts as well as the way in which the two Ovidian texts diverge in between. We will also be exploring the way the Ovidian versions utilise or engage with the Virgilian.

We continue our generic approach to the twice-told tale, with a focus on lamentation and divine action. We continue to see that the *Metamorphoses* uses lamentation when the *Fasti* does not, and the *Metamorphoses* again focuses upon divine action. However we also find that divine action, particularly divine punishment is important to the *Fasti*, and this we will discuss in relation to the position of Hippolytus within the two texts. Both versions of the Hippolytus myth are significant for their position in the texts; Ovid narrates both towards the end of both the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses*. We will therefore be alert to the possibility of closural themes in both texts. We may have expected the *Fasti* to have twelve books, which Ovid himself suggests in the *Tristia* (2.549-52). This would seem to indicate that the *Fasti* was either unfinished or the remaining six books are lost. Modern scholarship however is generally in consensus that Ovid, at some point and for some reason, decided not to complete the *Fasti*[183] but wrote book six to end the whole work.[184] This chapter begins to consider the structural arrangement and implications for the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* of Ovid's twice-told tales; an area we engage with more fully in the following chapter.

---

[181] Servius' commentary on Aeneid 7.761.

[182] There is also a version of this myth in the *Heroides*. We cannot ignore this additional intertext but I would note that *Heroides* 4 is an attempt by Phaedra to seduce Hippolytus by letter and does not detail his exile, death or resurrection as do the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*.

[183] Fantham points to the predominance of military festivals in the summer months (1983: 214).

[184] Most recently Littlewood's 2006 commentary argues that Ovid rewrote the end of the *Fasti*, adding the new internal structure and closural themes to form a coda to the work as a whole.

Both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* versions of the myth of Hippolytus follow a similar path, although some of the details differ: Hippolytus is journeying into exile and is beset by a monstrous creature from the sea, which so startles his horses that, demented with terror, they run wildly and jolt Hippolytus from the car. He, entangled in the horses' reins, is dragged behind them over rocks and dismembered. Diana restores Hippolytus to life but changes his name to Virbius. How these similar events are narrated differently in the two accounts and how the details differ is the main focus of this chapter. One of the key differences between the two accounts is that the *Fasti* is a more traditional account told in the third person whilst the *Metamorphoses* is a highly unusual first-person account. As a way to examine the moments of strong similarity, which seems to invite comparison, and the different ways in which the texts then diverge, we will examine the characterisation of the main protagonists in this myth.[185] We will see that Ovid has indeed created a twice (told) man, one in the *Metamorphoses*, one in the *Fasti*; Hippolytus' epic and elegiac personas are distinctly different.

One way in which Hippolytus is characterised in the *Metamorphoses* is with an element unique to this version of this myth: Egeria's grief. She appears only in the *Metamorphoses* version, grieving for her husband Numa, and her grief becomes entwined with the story of Hippolytus. Her loud lamentations disturb the worship of Diana, and Hippolytus, in his role as Virbius, attempts to quieten her with the story of his own misfortunes. Egeria is therefore the addressee of Hippolytus' tale and as such this thesis includes Egeria's grief and ultimate fate in the Hippolytus story (15.487-551). Segal calls Egeria's grief 'a fanciful enframing context' (1984: 314) Egeria also affects the shape and tone of this version of the Hippolytus myth as a whole. As with most tales from the *Metamorphoses*, the focus of the story of Hippolytus is blurred with the episodes surrounding it, and to discount Egeria from the Hippolytus story would considerably diminish it.

---

[185] Murgatroyd notes that the brevity of the mythical and legendary narratives in the *Fasti* leads to an economy of characterisation (2005: 142). Certainly it is true that these narratives are mostly shorter in the *Fasti* than the *Metamorphoses*, and as such characterisation is more succinctly done.

Egeria's presence facilitates the characterisation of Hippolytus in the following ways. Hippolytus instructs Egeria not to grieve, 'utinamque exempla dolentem/ non mea te possent relevare! Sed et mea possunt' (*M*.15.495-6). Here the repetition of the personal pronouns can be attributed, in some measure, to his desire to confirm his identity. However Hippolytus' repetition of 'mea' combined with the polyptoton on 'posse' makes his character sound very self-absorbed. This self-absorbed characterisation is continued after Hippolytus has finished the tale of his death when he remonstrates with Egeria; 'num potes aut audes cladi conponere nostrae,/ nympha, tuam' (*M*.15.530-1).

Exactly why Hippolytus thinks that the nymph is comparing her own misfortune with his is unclear as she does not speak, just weep. Hippolytus does indeed seem to believe the world revolves around his misfortune. Unasked for he offers a *consolatio*[186] and then is horrified that Egeria should think her misfortune comparable to his. The irony is, of course, that Ovid, as the narrator, is engaging in precisely this comparison with unflattering results for Hippolytus. This mismatch between content suggests the *Metamorphoses* Hippolytus and the Ovidian narrator are out of sympathy and this, in turn, prevents the reader from sympathising with Hippolytus.

Ovid's inclusion of Egeria was not simply an invention for the convenience of his *Metamorphoses*. Virgil makes the connection between Hippolytus and the nymph Egeria in his version of the Hippolytus myth, 'at Trivia Hippolytum secretis alma recondit/ sedibus et nymphae Egeriae nemorique relegat' (*Aeneid* 7.774-5). Virgil may be here following a tradition, indeed Ovid himself hints at a religious or traditional role Egeria may have played (*F*.3.259-284) (see particularly, 'quis mihi nunc dicet, quare caelestia Martis/ arma ferant Salii Mamuriumque canant?/ nympha, Numae coniunx, ad tua facta veni' (*F*.3.259-61)). Yet it is interesting that Ovid chooses to develop the character of Egeria so much in his own *Metamorphoses* version of this myth; here Ovid draws on and develops Virgil (to the detriment of Hippolytus). Egeria's inclusion in the

---

[186] The *consolatio* was an established genre in Ovid's time. The tactic of consoling the bereaved by reminding them that others have suffered losses is a common one in this tradition (see *Iliad* 24.602ff., or Euripides *Alcestis* 892). Cicero both wrote and received consolations (for example *ad Fam.* 5.16).

Metamorphoses may also highlight that in the *Fasti* version Egeria and the Virgilian epic precedent are not included, thus situating the *Fasti* on a lower generic plane to that of the *Metamorphoses*.

What is unique to Ovid is using Hippolytus to tell his own story. The pretext of consoling Egeria allows Hippolytus to deliver the tale of his death as a first-person narrative. Hippolytus' death was recounted in messenger speech in Greek tragedy (Euripides *Hippolytus* 1151-1254); Ovid's joke here is having Hippolytus being his own messenger (in much the same way that Apollo delivers a hymn to himself in *M*.1.456-465). This delineates Hippolytus in an unfavourable light as we will continue to witness.

Another use to which the Egeria framing context is put is that it introduces lamentation into the *Metamorphoses* account. The narration references Egeria's grief both before and after Hippolytus narrates his tale: 'gemitu questuque' (*M*.15.489); 'flenti' (*M*.15.492); 'liquitur in lacrimas' (*M*.15.549); 'luctus' (*M*.15.547). Hippolytus also uses words of grieving, 'querenda' (*M*.15.493) and 'dolentem' (*M*.15.495) to describe Egeria's grief. However, as the grief is related to Egeria, alone, it sits oddly with the tone of the Hippolytus story itself. No word associated with grieving is used during Hippolytus' narrative but Egeria's lamentation does place the emphasis on grief firmly on the *Metamorphoses* side of this twice-told tale. There is little lamentation in the *Fasti* account, although there is some, as we shall see when we examine the characterisation of Aesculapius. The distinction that Hinds found between the two rapes of Persephone, in that the *Fasti* focused more on lamentation, does not hold true in Hippolytus' twice-told tale. However, Egeria's grief is that of a weeping widow, and in many respects similar to Hersilia's grief in the twice-told tale of Romulus' apotheosis. There also we saw a widow's grief sit somewhat oddly with the overall narrative. We also noted with Hersilia's grief that Ovid appeared to be drawing on tragedy. This, I would argue, is the case here: Egeria's grief is engaging with the tragic mode.

Our consideration of Egeria's role has explored the tone which the *Metamorphoses* creates before the Hippolytus narrative proper opens. In contrast

the *Fasti*'s Hippolytean narrative opens on a separate day, the day after a short entry concerning the dedication of a temple to Summanus. The Hippolytus myth is followed by another short entry, the following day, this time warning Caesar against marching despite bad omens and relating this to 217BC, when Flaminius disregarded the omens. Neither of these surrounding episodes has much impact on the *Fasti*'s Hippolytean narrative. The *Metamorphoses* starts the main narrative with considerable 'baggage', which the *Fasti* does not.

If lamentation consistently fails to prove a reliable distinguisher between the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* twice-told tales we turn to one that does, so far, appear more reliable. In the three twice (and thrice) told tales we have examined so far in this thesis, Romulus' apotheosis, and the rapes of Callisto and Europa, divine action has been consistently more important to the *Metamorphoses* versions. Divine action in the Hippolytus myth is principally represented by Diana, the goddess to whom Hippolytus becomes a follower.

The difference in the use of divine action is highly instructive regarding the alternate ambitions of each text. Immediately we see that Diana has a much greater role in the *Metamorphoses* narrative. As we saw, the Hippolytus narrative opens within a religious context; that of Egeria's lamentations disturbing the worship of Orestean Diana, 'nam coniunx urbe relicta/ vallis Arciniae densis latet abdita silvis/ sacraque Oresteae gemitu questuque Dianae/ inpedit' (*M*.15.487-490). It is this disturbance of the goddess' rites that prompts Hippolytus to tell his story, making Diana an unseen presence throughout his narrative.

Diana's divine intervention is described as direct and effective in the *Metamorphoses* when Hippolytus stresses Diana's role in his protection and his transformation from Hippolytus to Virbius (*M*.15.536-546); Hippolytus spends eleven lines on the subject, a considerable portion of the narrative. We see the goddess save Hippolytus from discovery by obscuring him, 'densas obiecit Cynthia nubes' (*M*.15.537) and by changing his features (*M*.15.538-9). Diana decides on Hippolytus' new home (*M*.15.540-541) and also decrees, in direct speech, the change of name (*M*.15.543-4). The care which Diana took over Hippolytus is evident in her debating over Hippolytus' home, 'Cretemque diu

dubitavit habendam/ traderet an Delon' (*M*.15.540-1). Hippolytus' reverence for his divine patroness shows both in the length of his description of her actions and also in his pious homage to her, 'hoc nemus inde colo de disque minoribus unus numine sub dominae lateo atque accenseor illi' (*M*.15.545-6).

Hinds described the 'the angry exercise of supernatural power' as important to the *Metamorphoses* version of Persephone (Hinds 1987: 107), the emphasis is on 'angry', but at no point are there explicit references to Diana's anger in the *Metamorphoses*. Indeed her state of mind is little described; she simply and efficiently rescues Hippolytus. In the *Fasti* however we do find Diana described as angry by the narrator, 'indignante' (*F*.6.745).[187] This may be the *Fasti* challenging the generic position of the *Metamorphoses* (as we saw done in the apotheosis of Romulus); we will shortly survey Diana's actions in the *Fasti*. On a different level we may detect in 'indignante' another Virgilian intertext, when Jupiter is also described as 'indignatus':

> tum pater omnipotens aliquem indignatus ab umbris
> mortalem infernis ad lumina surgere uitae,
> ipse repertorem medicinae talis et artis
> fulmine Phoebigenam Stygias detrusit ad undas. (*Aeneid* 7.770-3)

However Jupiter's anger in the *Aeneid* is caused not by the death of Hippolytus, as Diana's anger is in the *Fasti*, but instead by his resurrection. The potential Virgilian intertext also raises the generic aspirations of the *Fasti*. Does the *Fasti* then offer a perilously epic account of Hippolytus, as it did with its version of the apotheosis of Romulus?

When we examine the *Fasti* closely we find that Diana's role is much less developed; she has no direct action described in the *Fasti*. Aesculapius speaks rather than Diana and Hippolytus' rescue and transformation are also described with little ceremony, 'lucus eum nemorisque sui Dictynna recessu/ celat: Aricino Virbius ille lacu' (*F*.6.755-6). Thus far it appears that the *Metamorphoses* does take more interest in the exercise of divine power.

---

[187] Although, of course, Hippolytus finds himself in this situation because of the angry exercise of Aphrodite's power. However this is not emphasised in either account.

We now turn away from Diana, as a symbol of divine power, to make the case that the bull, as a symbol of supernatural destruction, is a potent part of the divine exercise of power in the Hippolytus myth and as such deserves to be investigated. This is also a point of contrast between the two versions. The *Fasti* provides only a brief and not at all frightening description of the bull, 'dividit obstantes pectore taurus aquas' (*F*.6.740). In the *Metamorphoses,* however, Ovid exploits the novel opportunities offered by the first-person narrative: it allows the reader to experience, as if from Hippolytus' own position, the bull's sudden and horrifying appearance. The imagery is, as we shall see, extremely vivid, and there is emphasis throughout on the visual.

In the *Metamorphoses* the description of the bull commences with a description of an unnamed monstrous being rising up from the water, 'cum mare surrexit, cumulusque inmanis aquarum/ in montis speciem curvari et crescere visus/ et dare mugitus summoque cacumine findi' (*M*.15.508-10). The unknown nature of the apparition builds suspense into the narrative before the apparition is named as a bull in *M*.15.511. The description of the bull emerging from the water conjures forth a visual image in harmony with the word order, 'corniger hinc taurus ruptis expellitur undis' (*M*.15.511); the horns appear first in this sentence just as they would have appeared first from the water. The next detail of the bull one "sees" – the chest – is at the opening of the next sentence, 'pectoribusque tenus molles erectus in auras' (*M*.15.512). The nose opens the next sentence 'naribus et patulo partem maris evomit ore' (*M*.15.513). The enormity of the bull's mouth is emphasised by the word order – 'patulo' is separated from its noun 'ore' and the water does come from inside this wide separation. So with the description of the bull we see again the *Metamorphoses* more interested in the exercise of supernatural power, in this very epic and cinematic moment. This is unlike the *Fasti*, which all but elides this element of the myth.

If we move from divine action to human action, we may examine other actors in the Hippolytus myth, characters familiar to us from the tradition of Greek

tragedy, Hippolytus' stepmother Phaedra and father Theseus.[188] These characters appear in both the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* so we are able to make a direct comparison between their presentations in the two versions.[189] If we begin with the *Metamorphoses* we see the first-person narrative has another interesting consequence, it offers Hippolytus the right of reply to his father and stepmother. So how does the Hippolytean narrator characterise them? Hippolytus describes his stepmother as follows:

> Sceleratae fraude novercae
> occubuisse neci…me Pasiphaeia quondam
> temptatum frustra patrium temerare cubile,
> quod voluit, finxit voluisse et, crimine verso
> (indiciine metu magis offensane repulsae?)
> damnavit (*M*.15.498-504).

Here we can see that Hippolytus constructs Phaedra as a wicked temptress, words such as 'sceleratae fraude novercae', 'temerare', 'crimine verso' all paint a damning picture. Hippolytus also doesn't name his mother-in-law except by her matrilineal title 'Pasiphaeia'. By doing so he incorporates the scandal associated with Pasiphae and the bull and tacitly suggests that her family was notorious for its bizarre sexual appetites. We may also detect another intertext with Virgil's *Aeneid*. In this text Phaedra's actions are described as 'arte norvercae' (*Aeneid* 7.765). There also Phaedra is not explicitly named, but described in relation to her actions.

---

[188] The Hippolytus myth served as food for several Greek tragedies. Our main source is Euripides, who used this myth twice though only his second version is extant. In Euripides' second version of the Hippolytus myth, which won first prize in that year's Dionysiac festival, Phaedra is struggling against her desire for Hippolytus, and is betrayed by her confidence in her maid who approaches, contrary to Phaedra's wishes, Hippolytus on Phaedra's behalf. Phaedra falsely accuses Hippolytus of rape then kills herself out of shame. Phaedra is presented as an almost blameless victim of circumstance in this version of the Hippolytus myth. Euripides' first version of the Hippolytus myth does not survive but appears to have presented a completely different Phaedra. We owe our knowledge of the first version to Aristophanes of Byzantium who describes the play as 'impropriety so objectionable' (arg. Hippolytus. 25-30) (Barrett 1964: 29). The best attempt at reconstructing Euripides' lost version of Hippolytus is Barrett's excellent 1964 book which minutely examines subsequent references to Euripides' first and second *Hippolytus* including the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* Hippolytus (1964: 26f). It is Barrett's opinion that the first Euripides *Hippolytus* portrayed Phaedra as particularly shameless.
[189] Murgatroyd notes that in the *Fasti* Ovid restricts the main characters to a maximum of three per narrative (2005: 141). This is mostly true of the *Fasti* Hippolytus, the main characters there being Diana, Aesculapius and of course Hippolytus. However the use of these other minor characters helps to flesh out this Hippolytus account to a greater extent than other narratives in the *Fasti*.

Hippolytus in the *Metamorphoses* describes his father's part in his downfall with only two words 'credulitate patris' and so underplays his father's role in his death. 'Credulitas' though sometimes used as a negative term, as it is in *M*.12.59 where it is paired with Error and inhabits Rumour's halls, can also be used more in the sense of guileless.[190] One thing is clear, however Hippolytus intended 'credulitas' to be interpreted it is not as pejorative as those terms he applies to his stepmother. Hippolytus also uses the term 'patris' and in doing so includes their kin relationship and stresses the familial bond between them. It appears that this Hippolytus places the blame for his death upon his stepmother rather than his father.

So far we have focused on how the *Metamorphoses* characterises Theseus and Phaedra; now we turn to examine their characterisation in the *Fasti*. This version is told in the third person, and as such does not contain Hippolytus' vitriol against his mother in law; indeed the *Fasti* goes into much less depth about Phaedra, and her crimes than the *Metamorphoses*. All the *Fasti* does say, in a narratorial comment, is, 'notus amor Phaedrae' (*F*.6.737). Here Phaedra's passion for Hippolytus, and her possible deception of Theseus, is transformed from 'fraude' in the *Metamorphoses* version (*M*.15.498) to 'amor'. The *Fasti* also names Phaedra, and not just by her matrilineal as in the *Metamorphoses*. So we see the *Fasti* narrator, freed from Hippolytus' point of view, has chosen to briefly scud over Phaedra's involvement with Hippolytus' downfall and to mitigate her passion as 'amor'. Again an intertext with the Virgilian version may be pertinent. We have already seen that the *Aeneid* prefers to characterise Phaedra as the wicked stepmother. However there is 'amor' present in Virgil's version of the myth, but it belongs to Diana, 'amore Dianae' (*Aeneid* 7.769). There is no explicit mention of Diana's love (although we may infer it) in either of the Ovidian versions, but the virginal divine love of the Virgilian text has mutated to Phaedra's love in the *Fasti*. This may perhaps owe something to its

---

[190] This often of animals, for example, 'ego primus in illo/ caespite consedi, dum lina madentia sicco,/ utque recenserem captivos ordine pisces,/ insuper exposui, quos aut in retia casus/ aut sua credulitas in aduncos egerat hamos' (*M*.13.930-934).

elegiac status; the divine, chaste (epic) love of the Virgilian account becomes sexualized in the *Fasti*.

This eliding of Phaedra leaves a space in the *Fasti* version, for Theseus and his easy credence, 'nota est iniuria Thesei:/ devovit natum credulus ille suum' (*F*.6.737-8). Although, as Littlewood notes, Theseus is described in similar terms in both accounts; 'credulus' (*F*.6.738) in the *Fasti* echoes 'credulitate' (*M*.15.498) (Littlewood 2006: 216 n.738), the absence of Phaedra from the *Fasti* account does make Theseus' credulity more noticeable and, perhaps, more culpable. This similar choice of diction may direct us from the *Fasti* to the *Metamorphoses* account and vice versa, and allow us to compare the characterisation of Theseus and by extension Phaedra.

Ovid's use of the word 'notus' in the *Fasti* account is also interesting, 'notus amor Phaedrae, nota est iniuria Thesei' (*F*.6.737). Here the polyptoton on 'notus' draws attention to the word, as does its prominent positions both at the beginning of the line and after the caesura. 'Notus' may refer to the tradition of the Hippolytus myth; indeed 'notus' is often used in the *Fasti* to refer to texts with well-known mythology. However it could also be a signpost to the *Metamorphoses* version and to Ovid's other version in the *Heroides*.[191]

Does, then, the characterisation of Phaedra and Theseus offer any insights into the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* individually? In the *Metamorphoses* Phaedra is ostensibly the wicked step-mother, whilst in the *Fasti* her role in Hippolytus'

---

[191] How then is Phaedra characterised in this letter? Phaedra is unique amongst the heroines of the *Heroides*, she alone has not previously had a relationship with the man she is writing to, she alone is attempting seduction (Davis 1995: 43). As with most of the *Heroides*, letter four is heavily couched in the terms of love elegy, but with a twist. In attempting to seduce Hippolytus Phaedra takes on the role of the elegiac lover, not the elegiac mistress (Davis 1995: 43-44). The very act of writing shows that the Phaedra of *Heroides* four is more akin to that of Euripides' first version, the shameless seducer (Davis 1995: 43), despite her protestations of her moral character (Davis 1995: 49-50). Phaedra represents her desire for Hippolytus as based solely upon his physical appearance (*H*.4.67-84) (Davis 1995: 46-7). Phaedra also locates herself within the context of the females of her family, their scandals and as such justifies her actions (Davis 1995: 50-1). In the *Metamorphoses* Hippolytus refers to Phaedra by her matrilineal title and as such situates her similarly within her family. Phaedra also characterises her husband Theseus by emphasising, as she did in the second Euripides version, Theseus' wrongs to her, her sister Ariadne, her brother the Minotaur and Hippolytus' mother (Davis 1995: 51-2).

death is minimised to 'amor'. By contrast the *Fasti* is more interested in Theseus'
guilt in making a hasty judgement. We already noted that divine punishment of
Aesculapius was important to the *Fasti*. Here Theseus' over-hasty reaction adds
human injustice to the theme of punishment.

Having looked at all the minor actors in this drama we turn to the star of the
show, Hippolytus. As we have already noticed there is considerable difference in
the presentation of this character between the two versions of this indeed twice-
told man. In the *Metamorphoses* Hippolytus is unsympathetic, arrogant, self-
absorbed, and forgiving of his father. Perhaps the reader's sympathies with
Hippolytus are awakened in the *Metamorphoses* by the tales of his exile and
brutal death, and we will be able to overlook his character flaws. At the
commencement of Hippolytus' death scene, with the first appearance of the
monstrous bull, Hippolytus is further characterised by the juxtaposition of his
own reaction to that of his frightened friends, 'corda pavent comitum, mihi mens
interrita mansit' (*M*.15.514). The juxtaposition of his friends' behaviour with his
own behaviour is sharpened by the position of 'mihi'; also the alliteration of 'c'
sounds in the first half of this phrase makes it distant from the alliteration of 'm'
sounds in the second half of the sentence. As Hippolytus has previously been
presented slightly unfavourably, the sudden emphasis on Hippolytus' courage is
striking. We noted in the *Metamorphoses* that Hippolytus' opinions of his father
and mother-in-law did appear biased, and the accuracy of his depiction was
called into question. Here perhaps Hippolytus is giving an inaccurate description
of himself. It is as Segal says, 'we cannot discount the possibility that the poet
means for us to perceive his story as slanted in his own favour' (Segal 1984:
320). Hippolytus' characterisation, in the *Metamorphoses* is one of an arrogant,
self-absorbed and unreliable narrator.

Turning now to his death scene in the *Metamorphoses* it would be interesting to
observe Hippolytus' further characterisation through his description of his own
death, especially as the *Metamorphoses* account of Hippolytus' death is a
masterpiece of vivid and detailed description. However Ovid may perhaps be
suspected of forgetting Hippolytus' characterisation in the enjoyment of
describing his death, as we shall see. It is, nevertheless, still useful to examine as

it impacts on our understanding of this version of the myth and its place in the wider text.

After Hippolytus' lack of concern at the appearance of the bull is stressed, the pace of the piece slackens; it is the horses terrified by the appearance of the bull who supply the next dramatic impetus: 'cum colla feroces/ ad freta convertunt adrectisque auribus horrent/ quadrupedes monstrique metu turbantur et altis/ praecipitant currum scopulis' (*M*.15.515-518). The density of dactyls in this description of the horses' panicked flight adds to the mood of terror and speed (Littlewood 2006: 216 n.741-4). When the horses' wild flight causes Hippolytus to fall from the car, there follows a six-line description of his dismemberment:

> excutior curru, lorisque tenentibus artus
> viscera viva trahi, nervos in stipe teneri
> membra rapi partim, partim reprensa relinqui,
> ossa gravem dare fracta sonum fessamque videres
> exhalari animam nullasque in corpore partes,
> noscere quas posses: unumque erat omnia vulnus' (*M*.15.524-529).

This long period provides a very graphic description of the death of Hippolytus. The alliteration of 'viscera viva' (*M*.15.525) provides a most gruesome effect. The repetition of 'partim' in the middle of the line (*M*.15.526) is an effective way of representing the division taking place between Hippolytus' limbs. The alliteration in this line of 'r' sounds perhaps conveys a suggestion of the ripping sounds made by Hippolytus' limbs, and make the graphically imagined death sound more painful. The whole description of Hippolytus' death is rounded off in suitable style with 'unumque erat omnia vulnus' (*M*.15.529), a very striking image and sentiment.[192]

For Segal the use of the Egeria framing context 'wittily undercuts the horror' of the piece but this thesis has shown that the *Metamorphoses* account of Hippolytus' death is a particularly effective description of a gruesome death. The reader may be less emotionally engaged with Hippolytus, because of his

---

[192] Ovid's *Metamorphoses* version of Hippolytus is the closer of the two Ovidian versions to the Euripidean messenger speech (1172-1252), describing the death of Hippolytus. However in the Euripidean version the emphasis is on the bull, rather than Hippolytus' dismemberment. Ovid in the *Metamorphoses* has taken this element of the story and developed Hippolytus' grisly death.

unfavourable presentation, but that allows Ovid to go even further to making the account of his death horrible because he runs less of a risk of bathos. Instead the piece, and Hippolytus' characterisation, are deliberately humorous. Indeed there is considerable entertainment for the reader in having the boorish Hippolytus recount his own gory death.

The death of Hippolytus is so striking with its drama and gruesome detail in the *Metamorphoses* that his rebirth as Virbius receives less attention. This shifts the focus of the account away from his metamorphosis to his death and highlights the *Metamorphoses*' interest in the violent and graphic in the Hippolytus myth. We noted a similar emphasis on violence and the visual in the rape of Callisto.

Let us turn to compare this Hippolytus with the one we find in the *Fasti*. As the *Fasti* preserves the more traditional approach and narrates the myth as a third-person narrative, Hippolytus does not characterise himself through his speech. Nor is Hippolytus much characterised by other techniques; at present Hippolytus seems the uncomplaining object of Theseus', Aesculapius' and Diana's actions. In point of fact Hippolytus' characterisation in the *Fasti* lacks the depth of the *Metamorphoses* version. Where the *Metamorphoses* used Egeria and the frightened friends to characterise Hippolytus, neither are mentioned in the *Fasti* version and by extension nor are Hippolytus' arrogance nor his courageous reaction to the bull (and hence unreliability). The *Fasti* Hippolytus is more simply presented as a pious young man, for example, 'non impune pius iuvenis Troezena petebat' (*F*.6.739). Here the alliteration of 'p' sounds highlights the important concepts in this line: Hippolytus' piety, his unjust punishment and his journey. Further references to Hippolytus' piety occur at *F*.6.747, 'pio iuveni'. Indeed this is an essential difference between the two accounts. Where the Hippolytus of the *Metamorphoses* is an unpleasant character, and we can laugh at his misfortunes, the *Fasti* Hippolytus suffers apparently through no fault of his own.

Hippolytus' death scene in the *Fasti* is also brief at six lines in length (*F*.6.739-745). Considered proportionally, the *Fasti* allows just a fifth of the story to the

description of Hippolytus' demise (set against almost half for the
Metamorphoses):

> non impune pius iuvenis Troezena petebat:
> > dividit obstantes pectore taurus aquas.
> Solliciti terrentur equi frustraque retenti
> > per scopulos dominum duraque saxa trahunt.
> Exciderat curru lorisque morantibus artus
> > Hippolytus lacero corpore raptus erat
> reddideratque animam, multum indignante Diana. (*F*.6.739-745)

This account is much less dramatic than that of the *Metamorphoses*; only two
adjectives are used 'dura' (*F*.6.742) and 'lacero' (*F*.6.744). Gruesome verbal
effects are less used in this version, although one example is 'per scopulos
dominum duraque saxa trahunt' (*F*.6.742). Here the word order echoes the image
of the 'dominum' in the middle of crags and rocks and the alliteration also
creates a pleasing pattern s, d, d, s. Otherwise the description of Hippolytus'
dismemberment is straightforward.

The actual metamorphosis of Hippolytus into Virbius is brief in the *Fasti*; only
two lines in length, 'lucus eum nemorisque sui Dictynna recessu/ celat: Aricino
Virbius ille lacu' (*F*.6.755-6). Again this keeps the focus upon Aesculapius and
his healing powers rather than divine role which Diana played. In the
Metamorphoses, the resurrection/metamorphosis of Hippolytus to Virbius is
much more prominent and lengthy (15.536-46) and emphasises Diana's
beneficence as befits a tale told by a loyal servant of his divine mistress.

Although the *Fasti* version of Hippolytus' death is much briefer and less explicit
than that of the *Metamorphoses* we are still offered invitations to compare these
two different approaches. Similarities in diction occur, compare 'exciderat curru
lorisque morantibus artus/ Hippolytus lacero corpore raptus erat/ reddideratque
animam' (*F*.6.743-5) with 'excutior curru, lorisque tenentibus artus/ viscera viva
trahi, nervos in stipe teneri,/…unumque erat omnia vulnus' (*M*. 15.524-529).
Although the diction is similar again we can see that the *Metamorphoses* account
of Hippolytus' death is much more gruesome and graphic and the similar diction
may remind the reader of the *Fasti* of the fuller description in the

Metamorphoses account. We also saw above that Aesculapius' promise to give Hippolytus life, 'sine vulnere' (*F*.6.747) recalls *M*.15.529, 'unumque erat omnia vulnus' (Littlewood 2006: 217 n.747). There is also strong similarity between 'Troezena petebam' (*M*.15.506) and 'Troezena petebat' (*F*.6.739) in identical metrical position.[193] This repetition of diction is a strong invitation to compare these two very different narratives.

When we do compare these two narratives we find that the emphasis of the *Fasti* version of this tale is not upon Hippolytus' characterisation, his dismemberment, or metamorphosis, as it is in the *Metamorphoses*. Aesculapius, his healing craft and his punishment are the focus of the *Fasti* version of the myth of Hippolytus; ultimately told as the aetiological explanation for the Ophiuchus (or Anguitenens) constellation. In point of fact there were several explanations for the Ophiuchus constellation (Newlands 1995: 192-196).[194] So Ovid has made a choice to narrate this particular aetiology at this point in the *Fasti*.[195] The *Fasti* focuses upon Hippolytus' rebirth, with the aid of Aesculapius.[196]

When we surveyed divine action above we saw this theme to be more prominent in the *Metamorphoses* than the *Fasti*. However, although Diana's role in the *Fasti* is diminished and the bull, the agent of divine punishment, appears to a much greater extent in the *Metamorphoses*, we must not overlook the fact that the Hippolytus myth is told as an explanation of the divine punishment of Aesculapius in the *Fasti*.

Following the very tame description of Hippolytus' dismemberment, Aesculapius is given prominence by being allowed direct speech in the *Fasti*

---

[193] The references to Trozen could be related to Euripides' versions of this myth. Euripides' second, extant, version of the myth occurs in Trozen.

[194] Newlands' own explanation for the appearance of Aesculapius in book six of the *Fasti* is that, as Aesculapius' only other appearance is in book one, Ovid is linking the beginning of the text to the end and strengthening the closural themes of book six (1995: 192-3).

[195] Newlands (1995: 92) integrates the punishment of Aesculapius into Feeney's (1992) discussion on free speech in the *Fasti*. She considers that Ovid is demonstrating the effects of overstepping the mark in artistic efforts. I consider this to be stretching the case, Aesculapius is not a poet and it is not necessary to convert him into one, to see that Ovid is examining what happens when one oversteps the mark. Ovid is possibly also reflecting on his own exile.

[196] Littlewood notes that themes of rebirth and apotheosis were important to the closural motifs of book six of the *Fasti* (Littlewood 2006: 215 n.735).

version and speaks directly to Diana to reassure her, '"nulla" Coronides "causa doloris" ait;/ "namque pio iuveni vitam sine vulnere reddam,/ et cedent arti tristia fata meae"' (*F*.6.746-8). At three lines long this is a significant portion of the *Fasti* version and signals Aesculapius' importance to this version. His direct speech comes at the expense of Diana's, whose action, as we have seen is seriously circumscribed in this version; she has no direct speech. However, Aesculapius' boast, 'et cedent arti tristia fata meae' (*F*.6.748) gains an irony when one reads the ending of the tale, and continues this account's interest in divine punishment.

It is also Aesculapius' action rather than that of Diana which restores Hippolytus to life in the *Fasti* version (he is mentioned in the *Metamorphoses* at *M*.15.533f., although the focus remains on Diana). Indeed his miraculous actions in restoring Hippolytus are awarded six lines of description:

> gramina continuo loculis depromit eburnis
> > (profuerant Glauci manibus illa prius,
> tunc cum observatas augur descendit in herbas,
> > usus et auxilio est anguis ab angue dato),
> pectora ter tetigit, ter verba salubria dixit:
> > depositum terra sustulit ille caput (*F*.6.749-754).

Aesculapius also introduces a modicum of lamentation into the *Fasti* account, but like the lamentation we found in the *Metamorphoses* it is mostly of a peculiar kind. When Aesculapius tells Diana 'nulla causa doloris' (*F*.6.746) Diana's grief is implied but lamentation is negated by this statement - there is no need for grief as Aesculapius can resurrect Hippolytus. In the same vein, Aesculapius' description of Hippolytus' death as 'tristia fata' (*F*.6.748) is a temporary fate which Aesculapius is able to reverse. This reversal of fate also introduces a note of lamentation into the account because Pluto and the fates grieve, 'dolent' (*F*.6.757), after Hippolytus is resurrected but they grieve rather at life than because of his death. The only conventional incident of grief in the *Fasti* version occurs when Apollo grieves for Aesculapius after he is smitten by Jupiter's thunderbolt, 'querebaris' (*F*.6.761). This is a term traditionally associated with elegy and its roots as elegiac lament. Despite this one instance there is little in the

way of lamentation in the *Fasti* account of Hippolytus, especially when set beside Egeria's extreme, almost exaggerated grief in the *Metamorphoses.*

In contradistinction to the *Fasti*, Aesculapius' fate is not retold in the *Metamorphoses* at this point; his catasterism is foretold earlier in the poem, separated from the Hippolytus myth (*M*.2.642-8). This means that, in the *Metamorphoses*, Aesculapius' death comes before his resurrection of Hippolytus. This assists in keeping the focus of the *Metamorphoses* Hippolytus very much on the main actor, unlike in the *Fasti* where the tension of expectation of Aesculapius' death pushes the action forward.

If we look at the context for this theme of divine punishment in book six of the *Fasti* we find that theme is an interest for the book as a whole; we will explore this interest in divine punishment more fully in the next chapter. The *Fasti*'s interest in divine punishment is different from the closural themes used in the *Metamorphoses*. Whilst the bull could be described as an instrument of divine punishment, the focus of the last book of the *Metamorphoses* more generally is on themes of rebirth and apotheosis, such as Hippolytus' to Virbius. Prior to Hippolytus is an episode considered very important for the end of the *Metamorphoses,* Pythagoras' discourse, which we shall survey in greater depth in the final chapter, but that too deals with rebirth, in the form of reincarnation. Following Hippolytus' myth, Aesculapius' immediate fate (blasting with lightning) is not recounted,[197] but later (*M*.15.622-744) the tale of Aesculapius' voyage, in the form of a serpent, from Greece to Rome. Aesculapius' actions as a god form the penultimate episode in the poem before the apotheosis of Julius Caesar, which closes the *Metamorphoses.* This text could be said to quite definitely show an interest in the themes of rebirth and apotheosis.

From the standpoint of genre, whilst the divine punishment we witness in the *Fasti* might be thought to align the text to a more epic generic positioning, there may be other, non generic explanations for its presence here in the *Fasti*. If the end of book six was, as most critics suggest, reworked to finish the *Fasti*, this

---

[197] Aesculapius' death having been prophesied in book two (*M*.2.642-8).

work was probably conducted by Ovid in exile. This may suggest that rather than seeking a generic explanation for the divine punishment in the *Fasti*, we should instead consider a political one. Ovid is reflecting upon his own fate, or given the apparent unfairness of Aesculapius' fate, possibly comparing himself to the legendary healer, and the injustice of his own exile.

As we have seen this twice-told tale is full of invitations to compare between the two versions, which highlights the differences between the two Ovidian versions. In this chapter we have seen Hippolytus in the *Metamorphoses* version characterised by his own first-person narration and by the Ovidian narrator as arrogant and boorish. This text uses the repellent Hippolytus as an object for a gruesome, visual death. This is in many ways similar to the *Metamorphoses* version of Callisto, there she was made a repellent object and exposed to the reader's gaze.

Rather in the *Fasti* the focus is not upon Hippolytus, whose character is undeveloped, but on Aesculapius and his healing craft. Aesculapius' art and his punishment leads to an emphasis on divine punishment in this version. Interestingly for this thesis' wider argument we detect no interest in sexual comedy in the *Fasti* version. A text of flux, the *Fasti* does not include this element in all of its twice-told tales.

We have argued that lamentation proves an unreliable marker of generic positioning in this, and other twice-told tales. However divine action has previously been a strong marker between the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* accounts, the divine action firmly on the side of the epic text. In this twice-told tale we see this distinction not broken down, but slightly weakened; divine action is important to both texts although still to a greater extent in the *Metamorphoses*. However, divine punishment is an important theme generally for the last book of the *Fasti*, a theme we explore more fully in the next chapter.

Chapter Five: The Other Twice-Told Tales

In our previous chapter on Hippolytus we noted that the position of the two tales
within their individual texts contributed significantly to our understanding of
them. Both versions of Hippolytus are told towards the end of their respective
texts and as such are full of closural themes. In this chapter we survey the
remaining twice-told tales in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*; in particular we
focus upon the position of these tales, their structural importance and the
implications thereof.

Myers has commented that there is a preponderance of twice-told tales in the last
two books of the *Metamorphoses*, and in the first book of the *Fasti*, as if to
confirm that the *Fasti* is in some way a continuation of the *Metamorphoses*
(1994: 16). However there is also a cluster of twice-told tales that occur at the
last book of the *Fasti* (Hippolytus, Ino and Marsyas), their twins in the
Metamorphoses not occurring at any particular point (books fifteen, four and six
respectively). Therefore we must also question why the *Fasti* might end with so
many twice-told tales. If the twice-told tales at the end of the *Metamorphoses*
point forwards to the beginning of the *Fasti*, do the twice-told tales in book six of
the *Fasti* return us to the *Metamorphoses*?

Of the remaining twice-told tales the longest are the apotheosis of Julius Caesar
(*F*.3.697-710; *M*.15.745-870), Ino (*F*.6.473-550; *M*.4.416-562) and Tatius' Siege
of Rome (*F*.1.259-276; *M*.14.775-804). There are other twice-told tales which
are recounted briefly in one text and at length in the other, these are Aesculapius'
journey to the island on the Tiber (*F*.1.289-294; *M*.15.622-744); the rape of
Semele (*F*.3.713-718; *M*.3.256-315) and Marsyas (*F*.6.703-708; *M*.6.382-400).[198]

Let us now turn to examine a twice-told tale in a particularly important position,
Tatius' siege of Rome. This is the first twice-told tale in the *Fasti,* and is also
told towards the end of the *Metamorphoses*, in book fourteen. This is then the
first indication that these texts will contain twice-told tales and as such might be

---

[198] Murgatroyd (2005: 235) notes only eight twice-told tales in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*,
Lotis, Hippolytus, Europa, Ino, Romulus' deification, Marsyas, Callisto and Persephone.

important programmatically. Indeed Barchiesi argues that the god Janus (the narrator of this tale in the *Fasti*) should be read programmatically, 'the poem's readers will be taught to listen for a programmatic tone in his voice, and not just for factual answers to antiquarian queries and problems' (1997: 231). Janus' appearance at the opening of the *Fasti*, in which he remarks he was once Chaos (*F*.1.103) also parallels the *Metamorphoses*' opening with Chaos (*M*.1.5-9), drawing the two accounts closer together (Barchiesi 1997: 233). Hinds has also noticed this parallel and demonstrates that the two references to Chaos do work programmatically; 'From that point on, one cannot but be alive to possibilities for cross-reference between the two poems, and the possibilities are not few' (Hinds 1987: 43). We will examine to what extent Tatius' siege of Rome gives the reader direction (or misdirection) regarding the relationship between the twice-told tales and the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* as a whole.

We will now examine how this tale has transferred forwards from the *Metamorphoses* to the *Fasti*. Both tell, in essence, the same narrative: Tatius and his Sabine troops advance on Rome, and are led by traiteress, Tarpeia, to the Capitol where the bars to the gates to the citadel are undone by Juno. However the Sabine troops are repulsed by boiling hot water.[199] Despite following the same essential pattern there are also some interesting differences between the accounts, as we shall see.

There has been little scholarship comparing these twice-told tales, and that which has been written focuses primarily on the generic differences between the two.[200] Those differences include the *arma* of the warriors in the *Metamorphoses* becoming the *armillae* with which Tarpeia is bribed in the *Fasti*. There is also a reduction in warfare in the *Fasti* (the battle in the *Metamorphoses* becoming the repulsion of the Sabines in the *Fasti*). We will examine these generic distinguishers in greater detail below.

---

[199] Ovid's versions are the first surviving source of this myth to feature the element of the boiling water (Myers 2009: 195 n.775-804).
[200] See Heinze (1960: 333-5); Barchiesi (1997: 20-21); Merli (2000: 193-6).

The most obvious difference between the twice-told tales is that Janus narrates the attack in the *Fasti*, and this god takes full credit for repelling the attack. Most of the *Fasti*'s account is concerned with Janus' actions and their consequences:

> Et iam contigerant portam, Saturnia cuius
> dempserat oppositas invidiosa seras;
> cum tanto veritus committere numine pugnam,
> ipse meae movi callidus artis opus,
> oraque, qua pollens ope sum, fontana reclusi,
> sumque repentinas eiaculatus aquas.
> ante tamen madidis subieci sulpura venis,
> clauderet ut Tatio fervidus umor iter.
> cuius ut utilitas pulsis percepta Sabinis,
> quae fuerat, tuto reddita forma loco est;
> ara mihi posita est parvo coniuncta sacello:
> haec adolet flammis cum strue farra suis. (*F*.1.266-276)

The last couplet (*F*.1.275-6) elucidates the didactic function of this tale, to explain why spelt and cake are sacrificed to Janus, and the existence of his shrine in the Forum. The main narrative shows a preoccupation outside of this narrow didactic scope; Janus is characterised very effectively through recounting his part in defending the city (in a manner reminiscent of Hippolytus' narrative of his own death in the *Metamorphoses*). Janus emphasises his own actions, for example, 'ipse meae movi callidus artis opus' (*F*.1.268). He also implies that the Sabines were repulsed primarily through his own actions, 'cuius ut utilitas pulsis percepta Sabinis,/ quae fuerat, tuto reddita forma loco est' (*F*.1.273-4). As we shall see this is a remarkably different account to that which appears in the *Metamorphoses*. The *Metamorphoses* itself makes no mention of Janus' role. Instead it is Venus who calls upon the Naiads of Ausonia to act, and it is these nymphs who are responsible for the upsurge of boiling water. Janus is mentioned twice (*M*.14.785, 789) but only in the context of the location not as an agent of the action.

Reading this twice-told tale together could lead us to view Janus' own report of events with some suspicion. Perhaps here in the *Fasti* Janus is exaggerating his own involvement with events. Green particularly notes 'ipse meae movi callidus artis opus' (*F*.1.268) as 'light-hearted boasting that is characteristic of the god'

(2004 126: n.268). Indeed 'callidus' has a multitude of comic associations, commonly used of slaves in comedy or adulterous women (Green 2004: 127 n.268). 'Qua pollens ope sum' (*F*.1.269) is also described by Green as another instance of Janus' light-hearted boasting (2004: 127 n.269).

Here the *Fasti* and Janus contradict the Ovidian version in the *Metamorphoses.* We might choose to understand Janus as an unreliable narrator. Certainly, inaccurate and deliberately misleading narrators are prevalent in the *Fasti* (we will see two more later in this chapter, Minerva and Vesta). In some ways Janus, the wise old man imparting little known facts, could be seen as programmatic for the *Fasti,* both in his antiquarian capacity but also in his role as the unreliable narrator. However we might also consider that Janus, with his antiquarian knowledge and first-hand experience, is correcting the erroneous Ovidian version in the *Metamorphoses*. The *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, by presenting such different versions, problematize their narrators' reliability and deliberately destabilise this myth for the reader who knows both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*. If Janus' story is programmatic in that it is the first twice-told tale in the *Fasti*, it alerts the reader both to the similarity but also the potential conflict between the two texts.

Whichever way we choose to read Janus' interpretation of events, one thing is clear: the *Fasti*'s tone in this twice-told tale is considerably less grand, and less epic than the *Metamorphoses* account. The downgrade in the divine *auctor* and the possibly humorous characterisation of Janus and his self-important reworking of events both contribute to this conclusion. Green describes the tale as 'relaxed and light-hearted' with Janus' actions 'aggrandising his own power and intuition' (Green 2004: 122 n.259-76). This twice-told tale here sets a pattern, one which we have seen to be repeated in the other twice-told tales. The *Fasti* either focuses less on divine action or downgrades the divine action. The focus on Janus in the *Fasti* comes at the expense of Venus and the downgrading of Venus to Janus in the *Fasti* is part of that text's preference for minor deities over Olympian ones. If we develop this generic explanation the downplaying of Venus may also serve a

more programmatic function.[201] Venus may be the patron deity of elegiac love poetry but the contrast with the *Metamorphoses* emphasises her absence here in the *Fasti*: this is a different type of elegy, it seems, one for which Janus may be a more appropriate deity.

The primary focus of the *Fasti*'s account, Janus, is not present to any great extent in the *Metamorphoses*. The *Metamorphoses* account is by far the longer of the two and, as we shall see, is certainly the more dramatic, visual, and violent. The *Metamorphoses* increases the tension of the action by highlighting the slumbering, vulnerable state of the Romans, 'inde sati Curibus tacitorum more luporum/ ore premunt voces et corpora victa sopore/ invadunt portasque petunt,' (*M*.14.778-80). This comparison of the Sabines to silent wolves also increases the dramatic tension. There is also much greater description of the sulphurous water that repels the Sabines, (*M*.14.791-795). Myers notes that the direct apostrophe to the water, 'et Alpino modo quae certare rigori/ audebatis aquae, non ceditis ignibus ipsis!' (*M*.14.794-5) personifies it and 'makes the scene more emotionally charged' (2009: 199 n.795); certainly the apostrophe raises the tonal register. The violent battle which ensues is conveyed with a vivid description:

> flammifera gemini fumant aspergine postes,
> portaque nequiquam rigidis promissa Sabinis
> fonte fuit praestructa novo, dum Martius arma
> indueret miles; quae postquam Romulus ultro
> obtulit, et strata est tellus Romana Sabinis
> corporibus strata estque suis, generique cruorem
> sanguine cum soceri permiscuit inpius ensis.
> pace tamen sisti bellum nec in ultima ferro
> decertare placet Tatiumque accedere regno. (*M*.14.796-804)

Here the violent death of the soldiers creates a strong contrast with 'pulsis…Sabinis' (*F*.1.273) the repulsion of the Sabines in the *Fasti*. In the context of the *Fasti* it seemed that Janus was referring to the effects of his boiling water on the Sabines, but in comparison with this description we may wonder if

---

[201] Robinson argues that the downgrading of Venus in the *Fasti* is signalled in the first two lines of that text. He detects an allusion to Lucretius' *DRN* (1-2) and notes that Ovid chooses to exclude the reference to Venus found there (2010: iii). The relationship between Ovid's *Fasti* and Venus is at its most heightened in the proem to book four. See Miller (1991: 29-34), Herbert-Brown (1994: 81-95), Barchiesi (1997: 53-65).

in fact Janus was offering a brief summary of the martial combat. The emphasis on violence and a visual description of this violence in the *Metamorphoses* version of the siege of Tatius may well put us in mind of the death of Hippolytus. Whilst the *Metamorphoses* fully exploited the opportunities for drama inherent in his death, the *Fasti* chose to focus more on the actions of Aesculapius, a lesser-known, more humble character.

The previous scholarship comparing these two tales has focused upon this difference, namely the absence and presence of the battle in the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* respectively. As Barchiesi says, in the *Fasti* 'the god Janus intervenes in a perfectly bloodless way: his sulphur springs gush with boiling water…a hot shower rather than a bloodbath' (Barchiesi 1997: 21). Green also notes the absence of warfare from the *Fasti* and the generic diagnosis which has generally been made from this (2004: 121-2 n.259-76). Other epic elements in the *Metamorphoses* not present in the *Fasti* include the divine one-upmanship between Juno and Venus (in the *Fasti* Janus explicitly says he wishes to avoid conflict with Juno (*F*.1.267); for a reader that knows the *Metamorphoses*, this may well act as a signpost to the *Metamorphoses*, and the different account therein). Janus' relatively lowly position gives the reader a distinctly different perspective to the *Metamorphoses*, rather than the actions of the greatest gods, the reader instead experiences the action through the cautious machinations of a minor god. This lowers the reader's gaze to a lowlier and less courageous divine action; Janus 'mirrors the thematic priorities of the poem' (Green 2004: 125 n.267-70).

Tarpeia's punishment in the *Metamorphoses* also contains a strong engagement with that epic signifier, *arma*, 'arcisque via Tarpeia reclusa/ dignam animam poena congestis exuit armis' (*M*.14.776-7). This fate is not mentioned in the *Fasti* (Myers 2009: 195 n.775-804). Her punishment is not mentioned in the *Fasti,* which focuses instead upon her interest in the *armillae* offered to her as a bribe, 'utque levis custos armillis capta Sabinos/ ad summae tacitos duxerit arcis iter' (*F*.1.261-2). We see again that the *Fasti* chooses to downgrade the more epic element of the *Metamorphoses*. As Barchiesi says '*levis* (*F*.1.261) as she is, Tarpeia is unsuited to the gravitas of an epic poem.' The literal translation of

levis applies but in this context gains an extra meta-poetical meaning; that is a lighter genre of poetry. The *Fasti* stresses the reduced nature of *arma* in the *Fasti* but by doing so it also includes *arma* within its narrative albeit in a reduced manner.[202]

The ambiguous generic nature of this passage becomes clearer when we compare it with other versions of the Tarpeia myth found outside Ovid, namely in Propertius and Livy. In Propertius 4.4 we find a more traditionally elegiac version of Tarpeia's story (4.4). As one might expect from an elegiac text, Propertius focuses upon Tarpeia's love for Tatius. This is not present in the *Fasti* version: any love she has is for girlish trinkets. The *Fasti* may not be the same as the epic *Metamorphoses* but neither is it the same as Propertius' elegiacs. In fact if we turn to look at Livy, the Livian account focuses upon the various different explanations for Tarpeia's death (all of which involve gold bracelets or shields) (1.11). The importance of the *armillae* is also central to the *Fasti* version, though in a different way. Here we find the *Fasti*, deftly positioning this new type of elegy somewhere between generically diverse literary precedents. This complex engagement with different genres lies at the heart of the complexity – or flux – of the *Fasti*.

We have now examined Tatius' siege of Rome, this twice-told tale in such a potentially important position. We have seen that the *Fasti* version can be seen to be a continuation or correction of the *Metamorphoses* account, and as such calls into question the reliability of both Ovid and Janus as narrators. A relationship between the two texts emerges: the *Fasti* account is less dramatic, less violent and ultimately less epic than that of the *Metamorphoses*. We may also detect the *Fasti* introducing an element of humour (Janus' boastful exaggeration of his role in thwarting the attack of the Sabines). However this is not a conventional epic/elegiac distinction which is being portrayed here; the *Fasti* not only downplays *arma* but also downplays Venus and *amor*, those traditional constituents of elegiac poetry. With this initial twice-told tale we may wonder if the *Fasti* is creating a new kind of elegy and, having already looked at other tales

---

[202] Green views *armillae* as a compromise to allow the inclusion of *arma* within the *Fasti* (2004: 123 n.261).

told twice, we are able to confirm that indeed it is. However the relationship established in this twice-told tale is open to challenge, as we have also seen. In the apotheosis of Romulus not only does the *Fasti* not engage with some traditional elegiac markers, it engages strongly with epic motifs. This, as has been argued, it part of the way the *Fasti* creates and maintains flux.

It is worth noting here that the first twice-told tale in the *Metamorphoses* is that of Callisto's rape. There also we saw an emphasis on the gods combined with violence and visuality in the *Metamorphoses*. In the *Fasti* there is less emphasis on divinity and more on humour and innuendo. The two twice-told tales that come first offer a similar view of the relationship between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*.

We move now to examine another twice-told tale at the end of the *Metamorphoses*: Julius Caesar's apotheosis. This is the last twice-told tale in the *Metamorphoses* but unlike Tatius' siege of Rome, the *Fasti* counterpart is not told until book three, half way through the *Fasti*. The *Metamorphoses* devotes considerable space to Julius Caesar's apotheosis (*M*.15.760–851). One might also consider the praise of Julius Caesar prior to his apotheosis (*M*.15.745-559) and the praise of Augustus after the apotheosis (*M*.15.852-870) to also be part of the narrative. Here we find great emphasis upon Venus' actions in facilitating the apotheosis, including direct speech (*M*.15.765-778). There is also a lengthy direct speech from Jupiter (*M*.15.806-842). Indeed most of the *Metamorphoses* narrative of this apotheosis revolves around divine action.

This is in direct contradistinction to the *Fasti* version where the action of the gods is downplayed: instead of Olympian gods we have Vesta. Indeed, in the *Fasti* it is not just the status of the divine protagonist that is reduced: the entire narrative of the apotheosis is sidelined. The Ides of March are mostly given over to various explanations for the festival of Anna Perenna; a festival for the masses characterised by disorderly behaviour. The *Fasti* then devotes a mere nineteen lines (*F*.3.697-710) to this apotheosis, compared with the one hundred and seventy three lines given over to Anna Perenna (*F*.3.523-696). Scholars have noted the relegation of Caesar's apotheosis, and debated its effect. McKeown

reads this choice as motivated by literary precedent (Callimachus) rather than political concerns (McKeown 1984), whereas Newlands prefers to view this in terms of theory on the carnivalesque. She argues that 'the Festival of Anna Perenna conforms to the pattern of the carnival and therefore assumes an implied critique of hierarchical modes of thought and behaviour' (Newlands 1995: 321). She further argues that these ideas form a critique of normative behaviour, a differing perspective, which is tantamount to a criticism when placed adjacent to Julius Caesar's apotheosis (Newlands 1995: esp 334).

As with Tatius' siege of Rome, the *Fasti* places less focus on divine grandeur and also gives a slightly more comical, or at least ironic flavour. In one notable instance the goddess Vesta is given a voice and tells of her involvement in transporting Julius Caesar:

> 'ne dubita meminisse: meus fuit ille sacerdos;
>   sacrilegae telis me petiere manus.
> ipsa virum rapui simulacraque nuda reliqui:
>   quae cecidit ferro, Caesaris umbra fuit.' (*F*.3.699-702)

Here Vesta's actions in transporting Julius Caesar are rendered questionable by the adjective 'nuda'. It seems inappropriate that a virgin goddess should leave a naked male simulacrum (Newlands 1995: 335). The 'nuda' becomes even more inappropriate if one remembers that a key element of this story is that Julius Caesar maintains his dignity by carefully covering himself with his toga as he falls; a Polyxenian moment (Euripdes *Hecuba* 568-70).[203] This aspect of the *Fasti*'s narrative is even more noticeable for a reader who has read the *Metamorphoses*, as it is Venus who transports Julius Caesar to heaven in that text, with no mention of nudity. Newlands talks about the possible transference of tone from Anna Perenna's festival to Caesar's apotheosis (Newlands 1995: 336-7). Besides the nudity there is even greater disparity of detail between the two versions; Vesta transports Julius Caesar, leaving a simulacrum behind, whereas in the *Metamorphoses* Julius Caesar dies before being transported to the stars by Venus. The matter of the simulacrum is explored by Barchiesi who

---

[203] Robinson argues that a Polyxenian modesty had become part of the tradition of Julius Caesar's death (see Suet. *Div Iul.* 82.2) (2010: 369).

offers ways to interpret Ovid's presentation of this scene. Vesta and the simulacrum are new to the tradition of Caesar's death. As a consequence of this novelty Barchiesi notes the use of the simulacrum as having the potential to be seen as a moment of 'impeccable patriotism' (as described by Littlewood (1980: 321)) as Ovid's use of the simulacrum sees a divinely protected Julius Caesar escape actual bodily harm (Barchiesi 1997: 125). Barchiesi also notes the resemblance between the *Fasti*'s use of a simulacrum and the tradition which said only Helen's phantom went to Troy (1997: 126).

We also find that Venus, yet again, is replaced in the *Fasti* by a more minor god. The context for this second substitution of Venus is also very pertinent. This twice-told tale occurs in *Fasti* book three, and in the opening of book four Ovid assures Venus that she is not being sidelined, 'saucius an sanus numquid tua signa reliqui?/ tu mihi propositum, tu mihi semper opus' (*F*.4.6-7). Having been sidelined twice already in the *Fasti* Venus' concerns at the commencement of this book are given further context and weight. Not only is *arma* sidelined in the *Fasti* but also the patron deity of elegy. Ovid continues to create a new style of poetry located somewhere between conventional epic and elegy.

So far, in this chapter, we have looked at those twice-told tales positioned towards the end of the *Metamorphoses* and the beginning and middle of the *Fasti*. Now we turn to those tales told in the last book of the *Fasti*. As we have already surveyed several of the intervening twice-told tales we can see that despite numerous differences, including the *Fasti*'s adoption of usually epic motifs, the emphasis on divine action is greater in the *Metamorphoses*. We continue to witness this distinction in those twice-told tales at the end of the *Fasti*.

Ino is the subject of one of the three twice-told tales told in book six of the *Fasti* (*F*.6.473-550); its *Metamorphoses* counterpart is *M*.4.416-562, therefore towards the beginning of this text. The two stories follow a similar path to begin with. Juno, enraged that Ino is raising Bacchus, the son of Jupiter's adulterous love, Semele, raises Furies to torment her and her husband. Ino, in her madness throws herself from a cliff, taking one of her children with her. The *Metamorphoses*

delivers a story full of Juno's divine rage, and features a chilling and lengthy description of the Underworld. Ino's death is then followed by the transformation of her mourners to rocks and birds by Juno.[204] Murgatroyd argues that this adds 'a certain strangeness absent from the *Fasti* doublet by means of a distorted replay of the preceding events' (Murgatroyd 2005: 243). The *Fasti*, although it does detail the divine anger and retribution of Juno in this myth, devotes most of its narrative to the fate of Ino and her son Melicertes after she jumps from the cliff; Murgatroyd says the *Fasti* 'terminates triumphantly' (Murgatroyd 2005: 243). Here again the *Fasti* eschews the divine action of major deities in the story in favour of a less common, more didactic narrative (explaining the origin of minor gods Matuta and Palaemon, and the rites associated with Matuta and the Matralia). Here again divine action is a major distinguishing feature between the two texts.

This lesser emphasis on divine action in the *Fasti* is intriguing in the context of book six of the *Fasti*. Here the *Fasti* engages with the theme of divine punishment, as already witnessed in the twice-told tale of Hippolytus. Although the amount of divine action is the only consistent difference between the two texts, the *Fasti*, ever ready to challenge the *Metamorphoses*, engages strongly with this theme in its last book. Although twice-told tales in the *Fasti* generally features less divine action than those in the *Metamorphoses*, we notice an increase in divine action, in the form of divine punishment, in book six. As well as a generic challenge one might further consider the focus on divine punishment at the end of the *Fasti* to be a biographical element. Ovid, exiled to Tomis, was anxious for recall to Rome. A theme of punishment in the last book of the *Fasti* would be one reaction to exile.

Marsyas, another myth told in book six of the *Fasti*, also focuses upon divine punishment. Marsyas is a satyr who claims his musical skill is greater than that of Phoebus, is beaten in a musical contest with this deity and then hanged and flayed. This narrative is told briefly in the *Fasti* (*F*.6.703-8) as part of an address by Minerva explaining why this day is named *Quinquatrus* (which she does not

---

[204] This transformation is probably an Ovidian invention (Murgatroyd 2005: 243).

do, instead she recounts the story of Marsyas). The *Fasti* account relays the main facts of the narrative, and delivers the final punishment of Marsyas with little embellishment, in one line only:

> inventam satyrus primum miratur, et usum
> nescit, et inflatam sentit habere sonum;
> et modo dimittit digitis, modo concipit auras,
> iamque inter nymphas arte superbus erat:
> provocat et Phoebum. Phoebo superante pependit;
> caesa recesserunt a cute membra sua. (*F*.6.703-8)

The *Metamorphoses* however gives a much more graphic description of Marsyas' death, in keeping with the *Metamorphoses*' already noted interests in the violent and visual. The *Metamorphoses* devotes slightly more lines to Marsyas' story than the *Fasti* (*M*.6.382-400), but proportionally a much larger amount to Marsyas' death. Here we see a very graphic description of a death, and hear Marsyas crying out in pain:

> Sic ubi nescio quis Lycia de gente virorum
> rettulit exitium, satyri reminiscitur alter,
> quem Tritoniaca Latous harundine victum
> adfecit poena. 'quid me mihi detrahis?' inquit;
> 'a! piget, a! non est' clamabat 'tibia tanti.'
> clamanti cutis est summos direpta per artus,
> nec quicquam nisi vulnus erat; cruor undique manat,
> detectique patent nervi, trepidaeque sine ulla
> pelle micant venae; salientia viscera possis
> et perlucentes numerare in pectore fibras. (*M*.6.382-391)

Murgatroyd calls these lines 'full of horror, pathos and marvel' (Murgatroyd 2005: 246). The rest of the *Metamorphoses* account is occupied with recounting how the nymph's tears at Marsyas' death became a river called 'The Marsyas'. This increases the emotional register of the piece (Murgatroyd 2005: 246).

Murgatroyd has an intriguing theory as to the reason for the lack of colourful description of Marsyas' death in the *Fasti*. He argues that not only does Minerva give an inadequate explanation (she fails to explain Quinquatrus); she is also an inadequate narrator (Murgatroyd 2005: 246). This is because Ovid has deliberately, in the Marsyas of the *Fasti*, set out to construct an 'anti-narrative', a

narrative deliberately tedious (Murgatroyd 2005: 247). This is to include the humour of Minerva as goddess of wisdom being here unknowledgeable (Murgatroyd 2005: 247). This is part of the *Fasti*'s preoccupation with the role of the narrator, as noted with Janus, in the siege of Tatius, at the beginning of this chapter. Here rather than an unreliable narrator we have instead an uninteresting and uninformed one.

If we consider the distribution of twice-told tales we find there are three twice-told tales in the *Fasti*'s first two books, two in the third book, one in the fifth book and three in the final book. In the *Metamorphoses* there are four twice-told tales in the last two books but also six in the first six books. Whilst it has already been argued that the *Fasti* is a continuation of the *Metamorphoses* with the preponderance of twice-told tales at the end of the *Metamorphoses* and the beginning of the *Fasti*, this thesis argues that the *Metamorphoses* is a continuation of the *Fasti* also. The twice-told tales which cluster towards the end of the *Fasti* push the reader of the *Fasti* forward into the *Metamorphoses*. This creates a circular reading and adds further to this thesis' arguments that the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* can and should be read intertextually.

Chapter Six: Animal Sacrifice Discourses

We have now examined in depth four twice-told tales in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*: Romulus' apotheosis; Callisto's rape and catasterism; Europa's rape and catasterism; and Hippolytus' death and rebirth as Virbius. We have also looked at the remaining twice-told tales, particularly with reference to their position and the structural implications thereof. However, there is one more substantial intertext between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* which this thesis will examine. Previously in this thesis we have examined twice-told tales, narratives told in both the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*. In this chapter we will be advancing beyond narrative comparison and instead looking at the twice-told discourse on animal sacrifice. This is an interesting departure not least because Little, in his 1970 dissection of Heinze's comparison of the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*, argues that the *Fasti* is not a narrative poem and only if it were would 'a proper basis of comparison…exist between the two texts' (1970: 70). This thesis has argued against Little's position, and demonstrated that comparison of the narratives told-twice in both the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* is a useful tool. Comparison of the twice-told tales reveals a rich relationship between the two texts, a relationship fuelled by verbal signposts and invitations to read between the two accounts. However in this chapter this thesis argues that even when there is no narrative to speak of, comparison between the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* is still a valid exercise. There is sufficient similarity of theme combined with instances of shared diction to provoke interest between the *Metamorphoses*' Pythagorean discourse (*M*.15.60-478) and the *Fasti*'s discussion of animal sacrifice (*F*.1.317-456).

This chapter will fall into two parts, the first part focuses upon the comparison of the animal sacrifice discourses in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*. The second part hones in on one particular aspect of the *Fasti*'s discourse on animal sacrifice: Priapus' attempted rape of Lotis. This is the final example of the theme of sexual comedy which we have noted in the rapes of Callisto and Europa in the *Fasti*. We analyse this story and consider the place of sexual comedy within the *Fasti* more generally.

The Pythagorean discourse in the *Metamorphoses* is just that, a discourse narrated by Pythagoras. The *Fasti* on animal sacrifice is, however, told in the narrator's voice. Our examination of these passages will be slightly different to what has gone before; after all these are not twice-told tales,[205] but instead discourses on the theme of animal sacrifice. Instead, we will look at these two pieces thematically and survey the *bougonia*, the Golden Age, and the gods. In addition it will be possible to examine the characterisation of Pythagoras and compare that with the narratorial position of the *Fasti* on animal sacrifice. There is also enough similarity to allow for a comparison of the structure between some of the two accounts' description of animal sacrifice. It should also be noted that only parts of Pythagoras' discourse are closely aligned to the *Fasti*, that is to say those parts which discuss animal sacrifice, especially *M*.15.111-142. There are additional elements of Pythagoras' discourse which are not paralleled in the *Fasti;* these include a sort of '*De Rerum Natura'* on the perpetual flux of the universe.[206]

First let us contextualise these two discourses in their individual texts. Pythagoras' speech is considered structurally important to the *Metamorphoses*. Indeed there has been a tendency amongst scholars to treat Pythagoras' speech as a 'key' to the *Metamorphoses*.[207] Myers links the three major internal narratives in the *Metamorphoses*, book five contains the song of Calliope, book ten contains that of Orpheus, and book fifteen that of Pythagoras. It is Myers' proposition that 'these narratives clearly participate in a self-reflexive dialogue about the nature of the poem of a whole' (Myers 1994: 73). Hardie argues that the speech of Pythagoras should be taken with the philosophical cosmogony in book one as the philosophical frame of the poem (Hardie 1995: 210-11). However, not all critics view Pythagoras as of such central importance: Coleman considers that the relevance of Pythagoras' sermon to the rest of the poem is negligible.[208] This

---

[205] Nor are they one of the twin stories which Hinds identifies.

[206] There is undoubted intertextuality between Pythagoras' discourse and Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*, but this will not be the focus of my investigation.

[207] See Little (1970(a)), for one example, including a review of previous attempts.

[208] However, Coleman appears to be defining 'relevance' by the seriousness of the passage as humour is present in Pythagoras' speech (Coleman 1971: 462), but this does not necessarily destroy its import for the rest of the poem.

thesis will presently only commit itself as far as to agree that structurally the Pythagorean discourse is in a very important position in the text.

In contrast, the *Fasti* account of animal sacrifice, does not occupy such a significant position. It is close to the beginning of the work but is not the first major set piece, the honour of which is accorded to a conversation with the god Janus. However, as we will see below, animal sacrifice was closely linked with Augustus' religious revival, and the *Fasti* is a text purporting to celebrate Augustus, (for example *F.*2.15-16, and his successor Germanicus *F.*1.3-4). The *Fasti*'s approach to animal sacrifice may not be as structurally key as the *Metamorphoses'* speech of Pythagoras but it may have political import. However, as we argued in the previous chapter, there are several twice-told tales which appear towards the end of the *Metamorphoses* and at the beginning of the *Fasti*. This provides a forward driving impetus from the *Metamorphoses* to the *Fasti*; one can consider the versions of the twice-told tales at the beginning of the *Fasti* to complete or potentially challenge those at the end of the *Metamorphoses*. In this chapter we will be alert to the structural implications inherent in the relative position of the two versions of this twice-told tale.

We move now from the general background issues to engage closely with the two texts and focus particularly on a comparison of the perspectives of animal sacrifice. We commence with a very striking piece of shared content and similar diction: the description of sacrificial animals. In describing the different types of animal sacrifice Ovid uses the same animal order in both the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*: pig, goat, oxen and sheep. This order is not found elsewhere, although the pig and the goat are often linked as shown in Servius *A.*3.118. Ovid may have based this order upon a lost text or invented it to suit his own purposes, but the similarity in order is a further invitation to compare these two texts:

> 'Longius inde nefas abiit, et prima putatur
> hostia sus meruisse mori, quia semina pando
> eruerit rostro spemque interceperit anni;
> vite caper morsa Bacchi mactandus ad aras
> ducitur ultoris: nocuit sua culpa duobus!
> quid meruistis oves, placidum pecus inque tuendos
> natum homines, pleno quae fertis in ubere nectar,

> mollia quae nobis vestras velamina lanas
> praebetis vitaque magis quam morte iuvatis?
> quid meruere boves, animal sine fraude dolisque,
> innocuum, simplex, natum tolerare labores?
> inmemor est demum nec frugum munere dignus,
> qui potuit curvi dempto modo pondere aratri
> ruricolam mactare suum, qui trita labore
> illa, quibus totiens durum renovaverat arvum,
> quot dederat messes, percussit colla securi.' (*M*.15.111-126)

> prima Ceres avidae gavisa est sanguine porcae,
>   ulta suas merita caede nocentis opes:
> nam sata vere novo teneris lactentia sucis
>   eruta saetigerae comperit ore suis.
> sus dederat poenas: exemplo territus huius
>   palmite debueras abstinuisse, caper.
> quem spectans aliquis dentes in vite prementem,
>   talia non tacito dicta dolore dedit:
> 'rode, caper, vitem: tamen hinc, cum stabis ad aram,
>   in tua quod spargi cornua possit erit.'
> verba fides sequitur: noxae tibi deditus hostis
>   spargitur adfuso cornua, Bacche, mero.
> culpa sui nocuit, nocuit quoque culpa capellae:
>   quid bos, quid placidae commeruistis oves? (*F*.1.349-362)

The first two animals whose sacrifice is described, the pig and the goat, are presented in both texts as to some degree culpable and deserving of sacrifice. 'Culpa nocuit' (*F*.1.361 and *M*.15.115) is used in both texts; a remarkable invitation to compare between the two accounts.[209] Indeed, this phrase is highly emphatic in the *Fasti*, being repeated twice, 'culpa sui nocuit, nocuit quoque culpa capellae' (*F*.1.361).[210] This repetition of 'culpa' and 'nocuit' emphasises the guilt and destruction caused by the pig and goat. The culpability of the pig is further emphasised with 'merita' (*F*.1.350), making clear that the sow's death was deserved. The pig is also described as both 'avidae' (*F*.1.349) and 'nocentis' (*F*.1.350). The statement 'sus dederat poenas' (*F*.1.353) is factual and does not

---

[209] Varro's *Res Rustica* examines the sacrifice of the goat, at 1.2.18-19, in the context of a wider discussion on animal husbandry. He tells two aetiologies for goat sacrifice: vine eating leading to its sacrifice to Bacchus, and its ban from sacrifice to Minerva. Varro also discusses pig sacrifice at *RR* 2.4.9. and is just one aspect of Varro's discussion of swine. He does not discuss the origins of pig sacrifice; instead, Varro lists the circumstances in which it is customary to sacrifice a pig. There is no undertone of anti-sacrifice sentiment in Varro's account. Indeed, meat eating is endorsed when Varro details the tribes (Comacine and Cavarine) which make the best hams. At no point does Varro attempt to humanise the animal or sympathise with its plight.

[210] Myers has also previously noted the verbal similarities between Pythagoras on the punishments of sow and goat *M*.15.115-21 and the narratorial comment in *Fasti* 1.361-62 (Myers 1994: 139 n.26).

expand on the sacrifice itself. Similarly in the *Metamorphoses* the statement that the pig and goat deserved to die is plain:

> 'Longius inde nefas abiit, et prima putatur
> hostia sus meruisse mori, quia semina pando
> eruerit rostro spemque interceperit anni;
> vite caper morsa Bacchi mactandus ad aras
> ducitur ultoris: nocuit sua culpa duobus!' (*M*.15.111-115)

However Pythagoras ascribes the view to other people with *putatur* and uses the subjunctive to show that he is reporting the views of others.

The guilt of the pig and goat is then contrasted with what follows, the innocent cattle and sheep. In both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* this progression causes a change of tone; the innocence of the sheep and ox is emphasised. Sheep and cattle, which have not harmed mankind, are said not to deserve their part in animal sacrifice, 'quid bos, quid placidae commeruistis oves?' (*F*.1.362), 'quid meruistis oves, placidum pecus inque tuendos/ natum homines…quid meruere boves, animal sine fraude dolisque/ innocuum, simplex, natum tolerare labores?' (*M*.15.116-7 and 120-121). The adjective 'placidus' is used of sheep in both the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*, highlighting the interconnectivity of the two accounts. This was not a commonplace either; the only pre-Ovidian reference to sheep as 'placidus' is in Terence's *Adelphoe* 534.[211] To further highlight the outrage of killing sheep and cattle Pythagoras poses rhetorical questions concerning the offences of sheep and ox (none) and emphasises the good which these animals do humanity (*M*.15.116-121). The repetition of 'quid' and polyptoton of *mereo* links the two innocent animals. Pythagoras also uses 'ruricolam' (*M*.15.124) and 'colonos' (*M*.15.142) to stress the bond between humans and these animals. Surprisingly, in the *Fasti* Ovid again asks what the sheep were being punished for and this time offers an explanation, 'verbenas improba carpsit,/ quas pia dis ruris ferre solebat anus' (*F*.1.381-2). If one reads the *Fasti* after the *Metamorphoses*' impassioned tirade this explanation becomes more shocking although it could be explained by the *Fasti*'s status as a poem of *causae*.

---

[211] Searching Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina 2004.

Causae continue to be essential throughout the *Fasti*'s account of animal sacrifice. Ovid gives seven different etymological explanations to *Agonalis,* entirely omitted from the *Metamorphoses* version.[212] These aetiologies include those we saw above, the pig inciting the vengeance of Ceres, the goat nibbling at Bacchus' vines and then being anointed with the wine as a sacrificial victim, and other more unusual sacrifices; horse (*F*.1.385-6), deer (*F*.1.387-8), dog (*F*.1.389-90), and donkey (*F*.1.391-440). Pythagoras, although he mentions the pig and goat aetiologies does so with brevity, ''Longius inde nefas abiit, et prima putatur hostia sus meruisse mori, quia semina pando/ eruerit rostro spemque interceperit anni;/ vite caper morsa Bacchi mactandus ad aras/ ducitur ultoris: nocuit sua culpa duobus!' (*M*.15.111-115).

After detailing the sacrifice of the pig, goat, sheep and cow the two accounts depart a little further. The final sacrifice that Ovid describes in *Fasti*, after the Priapus and Lotis story, is that of birds, *F*.1.441-456. Ovid is most effusive on the innocence of the birds, their habits of building nests and warming their eggs, and the benefit offered to mankind by their sweet music, 'intactae fueratis aves, solacia ruris,/ adsuetum silvis innocuumque genus,/ quae facitis nidos et plumis ova fovetis/ et facili dulces editis ore modos' (*F*.1.441-444). Here the first phrase 'intactae fueratis aves' and the first word position held by 'intactae' stress that the birds used to be inviolate, in an age before sacrifice.[213] Ovid also talks specifically about dove sacrifice, 'suo coniunx abducta marito/ uritur Idaliis alba columba focis' (*F*.1.451-2). By delaying the subject 'alba columba' the reader does not know in line *F*.1.451 that it is a dove that has been snatched, the language could equally apply to human beings and renders the effect more shocking (Green 2008: 51-2).[214] These two lines are also reminiscent of *F*.1.333-4 because they stress the relations of animals that are broken by sacrifice.

> Et pecus antiquus dicebat agonia sermo;
>   veraque iudicio est ultima causa meo.

---

[212] Green (2004: 152 n.317-8) argues that fragments from the Praenestine calendar reveal that the etymology of *Agonalis* was disputed in ancient times, 'Agonalia…aut quia' (Degrassi 1963: 112).
[213] Green (2004: 204 n.441) calls this pre-bird sacrifice era a Golden Age.
[214] Green further argues for Ovid's emphasis on the traditional 'conjugal fidelity between the doves', therefore rendering its break-up more shocking. 'The sacrifice to [Venus] is described in terms of the splitting up of a loving "married" couple' (2004: 208 n.451).

> utque ea non certa est, ita rex placare sacrorum
> numina lanigerae coniuge debet ovis (*F*.1.331-334)

However the description of the white dove snatched from her mate is much more heightened than that of the sheep and we begin to notice a decrease in the acceptability of animal sacrifice in the *Fasti*: the culpable pig and goat has processed to the innocent and brutalised dove.[215]

References to birds are less sustained in the *Metamorphoses* account. They are, however, also mentioned in connection to the age before animal sacrifice, 'tunc et aves tutae movere per aera pennas' (*M*.15.99) and so serve an emblematic duty as reminder of days before slaughter. Towards the end of his speech Pythagoras calls the killing of birds, and other animals, akin to murder and paints a pathetic picture of a hand-reared bird, 'aut alite vesci,/cui dedit ipse cibos! quantum est, quod desit in istis/ ad plenum facinus?' (*M*.15.467-469).

The *Fasti*'s decline in acceptability of animal sacrifice is opposed to the Pythagorean view of animal sacrifice as utterly immoral from the outset and therefore not something that could decline in morality. However, Pythagoras' language does become more emotive as he progresses and creates a similar crescendo to that of *Fasti*'s documentation of animal sacrifice. In *M*.15.89 the golden line heightens the poetic tension appropriate to Pythagoras' first outbreak of righteous indignation, 'ingestoque avidum pinguescere corpore corpus' (*M*.15.89). From line *M*.15.96 the tone softens and becomes less polemic before building to another crescendo, 'cumque boum dabitis caesorum membra palato,/ mandere vos vestros scite et sentite colonos' (*M*.15.141-2).

We might at this juncture wish to consider the effect of animal sacrifice being portrayed as wicked by Pythagoras, and increasingly unacceptable by the Ovidian narrator, in the context of Ovid's contemporary Rome. 'Animal sacrifice had always been an integral part of Roman religious practice, the principal means of honouring the gods and of providing a channel through which to communicate

---

[215] Green (2004: 203 n.441-56) also argues that the *Fasti*'s structure demonstrates the decline of the morality of animal sacrifice.

and negotiate with them' (Green 2008: 41-2). Augustus' religious revival put religion, including animal sacrifice, in a very prominent position.[216] Our evidence for the prominence of animal sacrifice in the Augustan period is the wealth of images depicting sacrifice. The frequent portrayal of Augustus *togate* and the depiction on the Ara Pacis of Augustus' family in a sacrificial procession proves that Augustus wished his religious devotion to be seen. Sacrificial imagery survives on architecture (such as the Ara Pacis), and on coins depicting animal sacrifice. The below coin of C. Antistius Vetus was minted in Rome in 16 BC.

More recently understood than the role of sacrifice in public life is the role of sacrifice in literature. Feeney articulates that literary texts have their own distinctive engagement with ritual and do not offer exact representations (Feeney 2004: 4-5).[217] Let us explore this idea through examination of the relationship between Ovid's discourses on animal sacrifice and Virgil's *Georgics*. All of Ovid's works, in particular the *Fasti*, engage with Virgil's works, and of all the twice-told tales it is this one, the discourses on animal sacrifice, which has most to do with Virgil.[218] The representation of animal sacrifice in Virgil's *Georgics* is exceedingly complex but the scholarly consensus is that Virgil uses, to quote an example from Green, 'subtle tactics to undermine and question the validity of the practice' (Green 2004: 165 n.349-456i). Gale argues that references to animal sacrifice have 'a sense of unease which…increases as the poem goes on' (2000:

---

[216] See Green (2004: 165 n349-456ii) for a summary of Augustus' reforms.

[217] Feeney provides a useful guide to the issues surrounding the portrayal of animal sacrifice in classical literature and also reviews two recent articles on the role of sacrifice in the *Georgics*, the first by Habinek (Habinek 1990) and the second Thomas' discussion of Habinek (Thomas 1991).

[218] The relationship between the *Fasti* as a whole and the Virgilian *oeuvre* is under-researched. Murgatroyd is the first to claim to attempt a text wide analysis of this relationship (2005: 97ff.).

106). An example of this unease and questioning of validity might be Virgil's presentation of cattle sacrifice, *Georgics* 3.489-493, which is influenced by the dark tone of the plague in book three (Gale 2000: 106). Ovid's text is clearly engaged with the *Georgics*, 'ac vix suppositi tinguntur sanguine cultri' *Georgics* 3.492 is echoed very closely in *Fasti* 1.321 'qui calido strictos tincturus sanguine cultros'. This engagement extends beyond simple verbal echoes so the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* passages 'act as a kind of commentary on the Virgilian model' (Gale 2000: 108).[219] Ovid (in typical Ovidian style) makes more pronounced these traits he finds in his source material; the *Fasti* becomes a more definite denunciation of animal sacrifice than the subtle techniques Virgil uses.

If we pursue this theme of animal sacrifice made unacceptable, we noted above that both texts contained references to an age before animal slaughter and meat eating. In the *Metamorphoses* this is linked to the Golden Age and we turn now to examine the two texts' presentation of life before animal sacrifice. In the *Metamorphoses* Pythagoras explicitly refers to the Golden Age, 'vetus illa aetas, cui fecimus aurea nomen' (*M*.15.96). The *Fasti* does not name the Golden Age as such but, as this thesis will demonstrate, describes some of the attributes of the Golden Age. To identify how the two texts engage with Golden Age themes we embark on a brief tour of the tradition of the Golden Age, particularly as is relevant to our discussion of the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti.*

The earliest example of golden living is in Hesiod's *Works and Days* (109-201) although he describes the Golden Race rather than the Golden Age. Hesiod goes on to describe the descent from the Golden Race through the Silver Race, Bronze Race, and the race of Heroes to the Iron Race. Hesiod details the reason for this decline: the Silver Race was impious for failing to sacrifice properly to the gods (138-9). After Hesiod a shift occurs in the reason for the decline of the Golden Race. Aratus' *Phaenomena*, a poem popular with Romans, links the end of the Golden Race and the end of vegetarianism (132). Empedocles also makes it explicit that meat eating, to some degree, accompanied the end of the Golden Race (fragment 118 Wright).

---

[219] See Gale (2000: 108-112) for the development of this position.

Latin poets, previous to Ovid, had glossed-over lack of meat eating as part of the Golden Age. Virgil in *Eclogue* four implies vegetarianism in his statement that the prey shall not fear their predators (22) but does not give any specific examples. Virgil in the *Georgics* (1.118-135) emphasises the lack of work and spontaneous food production of the Golden Age, rather than vegetarianism 'ipsaque tellus/ omnia liberius nullo poscente ferebat' (*Georgics* 1.127-8). Virgil does mention that it was not until after the Golden Age that men learnt to catch animals (*G*.139-142), but in this context, a catalogue of skills, no explicit connection is made that meat eating caused the end of the Golden Age. Horace (*Epode* 16.39-66) also describes the Golden Age, but makes no reference to meat eating. Tibullus in 2.3.68-70 describes acorns as the food of the ancients but does not explicitly state they were vegetarians, nor does he link the end of the Golden Age with meat eating.

Ovid, in Pythagoras' discourse in the *Metamorphoses,* makes highly explicit that meat eating caused the end of the Golden Age. The *Metamorphoses* describes the Golden Age as having two main characteristics: that of abundant natural resources when the earth spontaneously produced food (*M*.15.96-98) and the lack of meat eating, 'nec polluit ora cruore' (*M*.15.98). In *Metamorphoses* 15.96-103, Pythagoras highlights several creatures that were then free from harm; birds, hare and the fish (*M*.15.99-103). Each of these animals is described in one line together with their innocent, golden age behaviour. For example, 'lepus inpavidus mediis erravit in arvis' (*M*.15.100).

The *Fasti* does not make so explicit the link between meat eating and the end of the Golden Age; it does not even name the Golden Age. However, if we examine the literary tradition we can see that the *Fasti* is describing something that evokes a Golden Age:

> ante, deos homini quod conciliare valeret,
> > far erat et puri lucida mica salis.
> nondum pertulerat lacrimatas cortice murras
> > acta per aequoreas hospita navis aquas, 340
> tura nec Euphrates nec miserat India costum,
> > nec fuerant rubri cognita fila croci.
> ara dabat fumos herbis contenta Sabinis,

> et non exiguo laurus adusta sono;
>   siquis erat factis prati de flore coronis
>   qui posset violas addere, dives erat.
>   hic, qui nunc aperit percussi viscera tauri,
>   in sacris nullum culter habebat opus. (*F*.1.337-348)

We have a description of the Golden Age in the *Metamorphoses* directly before the description of man's descent into carnivorism in the Pythagorean dialogue (*M*.15.96-103), which increases the temptation to read *F*.1.337-348 as an alternative description of the Golden Age.

There is no precedent in the Golden Age tradition of offerings of salt and spelt. Here Ovid could be describing an early civilisation rather than the Golden Age. Or Ovid could be echoing the offerings that Pythagoras reportedly made (Diogenes Laertius 8.13).[220] 'Far erat' *F*.1.338 is a very simple statement which echoes the simplicity of the offerings. The lack of ships, foreign travel and imports (*F*.1.339-342), however, puts this account in the Golden Age tradition. Virgil in *Eclogue* Four describes the Golden Age that will accompany the birth of a child; this is explicitly stated in 4.9 'toto surget gens aurea mundo'. One of the conditions which will accompany this Golden Age is a lack of sea travel and trade, 'cedet et ipse mari vector, nec nautica pinus/ mutabit merces' (*Eclogues* 4.38-9). The *Fasti* version, though not explicitly called a Golden Age, is describing something that closely resembles a Golden Age.

What we can see here is that the two accounts are working structurally in tandem. Both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* describe a Golden Age without animal sacrifice before describing a descent into meat eating. Both accounts are also doing something a little unusual. The *Metamorphoses* is linking the Golden Age with vegetarianism in a way that is unprecedented in the Latin tradition (so far as we know). The *Fasti* is emphasising the simplicity of the offerings made before animal sacrifice. Ovid has engaged his two accounts of the Golden Age seemingly with two different traditions. The *Metamorphoses* looks back to the

---

[220] Whether Pythagoras did offer live sacrifice is a vexed question, with contradictory evidence from the sources. This confusion is evident in Diogenes Laertius 8.20-22, which acknowledges the confusion and adds that although some claim he refused to make any live sacrifices others believed he would sacrifice cocks, goats, and pigs. See again Levy 1926 and Burkert 1972.

Greek philosophical movement that the end of the Golden Age was triggered by meat-eating whilst the *Fasti* looks back to a simple, antique era characterised by the plainness of its sacrificial offerings. These parallels and the subtle differences between the two accounts offer further compelling invitations to compare the two animal sacrifice discourses.

We move now from the Golden Age to look at another sacrifice tradition which Ovid describes in both the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*: the practice of *bougonia,* a ritual burial of a bovine carcass leading to the spontaneous creation of bees. *Bougonia* had a well-established tradition in the ancient world, for which our primary sources are (aside from the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*) Varro *Res Rustica* 2.5.5 and Virgil *Georgics* 4.281-314. Varro's *bougonia* is brief, 'denique ex hoc putre facto nasci dulcissimas apes,/ mellis matres, a quo eas Graeci bugenes appellant' (*R.R.* 2.5.5) and emphasises the products, the honey and the bees, rather than the sacrificial element. The reference to the Greek name 'Graeci bugenes appellant', and a lack of specific detail in Varro's account suggest that this was an antiquated practice. The *bougonia* in Virgil's *Georgics*, like the sacrifice in that text, is a hot topic of debate.[221] In fact, Virgil twice narrates the *bougonia,* once at 4.281-314, in the narrator's voice, and at 4.531-558 in Cyrene's voice. The two descriptions contain different details; the method of death is clubbing in 4.301-2 but is slitting the throat in 4.542-3. The lack of precision in the information here given in the *Georgics*[222] also suggests that this was not a ritual that Virgil envisioned his reader performing.

References to Aristaeus provide further evidence that Virgil is not attempting accuracy in his *bougonia*. There is no evidence for Aristaeus in the myth before Virgil (Green 2004: 171), it seems that here Virgil is inventing a history for the practice of *bougonia*. Virgil also builds complexity into his version by giving Aristaeus a very complex character. He is nominally a shepherd, and part of the farming world of the *Georgics*.[223] However, we discover that he is the cause of

---

[221] Gale summarises the debate on whether the *bougonia* is in fact a sacrifice (2000: 110 n.170).
[222] As in the description of the plough (*Georgics* 1.171-2).
[223] 'O fortunatos nimium, sua si bona norint,/ agricolas! Quibus ipsa, procul discordibus armis,/ fundit humo facilem victum iustissima tellus' (*G.*2.458).

Eurydice's death (*G.* 4.457-459), and such is the emotional power of the Orpheus and Eurydice story that it must prejudice our opinion of Aristaeus.

Ovid follows the Virgilian tradition and includes Aristaeus in one of his *bougonia*s (*F.*1.361-380). Ovid in the *Fasti* chooses to make Aristaeus not just the founder of *bougonia*, but also, in this capacity, the progenitor of all oxen sacrifice. Ovid here enlarges upon Aristaeus' role and in doing so focuses the reader's attention upon his character. If we read the *Fasti* with the Virgilian intertext we may bring some of Aristaeus' dubious moral standing to our understanding of the *Fasti*. The morality of oxen sacrifice may be further undermined by this Virgilian reference.

However, perhaps we should not consider this intertextual relation too strongly in our interpretation of Aristaeus: Ovid invites the reader to sympathise with Aristaeus' quest. Ovid highlights Aristaeus' grief at the devastation of his beehives as 'flebat' (*F.*1.363), which opens this story in the emphatic first-word position. Aristaeus' grief at the death of his bees is further illustrated with 'dolentem' (*F.*1.365) and the consolation his mother offers Aristaeus, 'siste, puer, lacrimas' (*F.*1.367), all combine to render the sacrifice of the cow more understandable. Nevertheless, Green detects some ambivalence towards animal sacrifice in the phrase 'mille animas una necata dedit' (*F.*1.380); he argues that Aristaeus' grief is fuelled by the loss of the honeycombs rather than the bees (2004: 176 n.380) and this undercuts our sympathy with Aristaeus and his actions. Ovid has taken a complicated Virgilian picture and made it more so.

If we look more closely at Aristaeus we find that not only is Ovid engaging with the Virgilian intertext, he is using it to mislead the reader. A reader acquainted with the *Georgics* might expect Ovid to carry on from the capture of Proteus to the tale of Orpheus and Eurydice, which he omits in its entirety (Murgatroyd 2005: 12).[224] Ovid misleads the readers' expectations in this respect by echoing

---

[224] We also saw the reader misled in the Callisto myth, although there the intertext was between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* rather than between the *Fasti* and the *Georgics*. Murgatroyd also presents an interesting discussion of the Aristaeus myth in visual, filmic terms (Murgatroyd 2005: 14).

the Virgilian account closely until *F*.1.375 (Murgatroyd 2005: 109).[225] If we expect the Virgilian ending to the myth we are also more likely to read the dubious character of Aristaeus into the *Fasti*. In addition, Murgatroyd sees the expressions of grief, discussed above, as part of the intertext between the Virgilian account of Aristaeus, Orpheus and Eurydice and this account of *bougonia*. By including so many expressions of grief Ovid is tricking the reader into expecting Proteus to tell the story of Orpheus and Eurydice (whereas he actually launches straight into a description of oxen slaughter) (2005: 228). If we follow Murgatroyd's argument we may see that here the intertext between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* is complicated with the intertext between the *Fasti* and the *Georgics*. This is an interesting point; although we have seen several invitations to compare between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* there are also other strong intertextual forces at work in these texts.

But let us continue with the focus on comparing the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, and we find further similarity of diction between the two accounts, 'obrue mactati corpus tellure iuvenci' (*F*.1.377) resembles, 'in scrobe deiecto mactatos obrue tauros' (*M*.15.364) closely enough to constitute a link between the two accounts. However, the similarities between the two versions of *bougonia* end there. Pythagoras' oxen *bougonia* is brief in comparison to the *Fasti*'s, and does not include Aristaeus (*M*.15.364-367). The tone here is one of scientific investigation, with repeated references to evidence discernible by the senses, 'nonne vides' (*M*.15.362), 'cognita res usu' (*M*.15.365), echoing the style of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*. In addition to describing oxen *bougonia* Pythagoras spends a surprising length describing *bougonia* of other kinds: the burial of horses to produce hornets, (*M*.15.368), crab claws to produce scorpions (*M*.15.369-371), and worms to produce funereal butterflies (*M*.15.372-4). This is all rather peculiar, oxen *bougonia* produces bees which are described as industrious workers (*M*.15.366-37) that produce honey for mankind. Hornets and scorpions have no positive contribution to human life, are rather dangerous, and the scorpions are described as aggressive, 'scorpius exibit caudaque minabitur

---

[225] Murgatroyd argues that 'Ovid is impishly implying...that Virgil went too far [with the story of Eurydice and Orpheus], with the sensationalism and the heavy, heady pathos' (2005: 110). This is a very plausible, and very Ovidian explanation, but a simpler explanation might be that Ovid was introducing variety into his account.

unca' (*M*.15.371). Pythagoras may be implicitly undermining the practice of *bougonia* with these increasingly unattractive examples, although he never explicitly argues against the practice. Pythagoras, as we have seen, adds a tone of scientific investigation but may also be surveying these other *bougonias* in an effort to undermine the practice.

There are further differences in the overall structure and effect of the *bougonia*s. The *Fasti* interrupts the lament for the oxen and sheep with a *bougonia*. The lament for these animals is picked up again in *F*.1.381ff., although only for two couplets. This disruption of subject and tone somewhat lessens the pathetic impact of this description of animal sacrifice. Pythagoras instead delays his description of bougonia for over 200 lines after he first describes oxen sacrifice so continues to heighten the pathetic tone to the confusion of the oxen which comes to a head with, 'auditque ignara precantem' *M*.15.132 and the brutality of the human violence, 'protinus ereptas viventi pectore fibras/ inspiciunt' (*M*.15.136-137).

We have seen that the *Metamorphoses* adds a scientific and Lucretian aspect to its *bougonia*. Indeed, Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* was an important source for Ovid, including Pythagoras' discussion of animal sacrifice. The *DRN* contains four accounts of animal sacrifice, 2.352-66, 3.48-58, 4.1236-7, 5.1198-202, that do not present sacrifice entirely positively, but sacrifice is subordinate to Lucretius' interest in humanity and the human mind; for example, in 4.1236 Lucretius is explicit that sacrifice does not aid fertility. Only in 2.352-66 does Lucretius display a horror of animal sacrifice with a cow searching for a lost calf, and explicitly attributes to the cow a human-like grief, 'desiderio perfixa iuvenci' (*DRN* 2.360). However, Lucretius is not explicitly denouncing animal sacrifice for moral reasons (whatever the pathetic imagery of 2.352-66 may suggest) rather because it shows a lack of rational thought, 'sed mage placata posse omnia mente tueri' (*DRN* 5.1203). Ovid differs from his Lucretian source matter in both the texts; Pythagoras argues against animal sacrifice *per se* and the *Fasti* shows a gradual decline in the morality of animal sacrifice. However, Ovid's description of animal sacrifice (*M*.15.130-5) recalls Lucretius' sacrifice of Iphigenia, especially 1.89-92. Ovid focuses on the sacrificial knife and the victim's fear, as

does Lucretius. Both authors focalise the sacrifice through the victim. Ovid also goes further than just engaging with Lucretius and engages with Lucretius' model, Empedocles. The Empedoclean model blurs the distinction between human and animal. By referencing elements of the *DRN*'s sacrifice of Iphigenia in the *Metamorphoses* discussion of animal sacrifice, Ovid is also blurring the distinction between human and animal. Ovid, therefore, demonstrates an awareness of both Lucretius and Lucretius' model Empedocles.[226]

We move now from our discussion of *bougonia* onto the role of the gods in animal sacrifice in the two texts. Here we find an intriguing difference complicated by similar diction. The gods' role in the *Metamorphoses* is straightforward; Pythagoras suggests that man has created the idea that the gods rejoice in sacrifice, 'nec satis est, quod tale nefas committitur: ipsos/ inscripsere deos sceleri numenque supernum/ caede laboriferi credunt gaudere iuvenci' (*M*.15.127-129). This statement is bold and the lack of adjectives (one only is used, 'laboriferi') makes Pythagoras' claim more arresting as it stands out from the surrounding text. Pythagoras presents gods as distant and disapproving of animal sacrifice.

The *Fasti* instead puts divine motivation as central to the instigation of animal sacrifice. Ovid, in the *Fasti*, emphasises Ceres' involvement in the condemnation of the pig with a striking image of Ceres rejoicing in the blood of this animal. This is an image that leaves no room for a more ambivalent divine attitude to animal sacrifice, 'prima Ceres avidae gavisa est sanguine porcae/ ulta suas merita caede nocentis opes' (*F*.1.349-350). Ovid has separated 'gavisa' from 'sanguine' to emphasise the goddess' enjoyment of the blood. The juxtaposition of Ceres and 'avidae' and that adjective's separation from its noun 'porcae' may associate Ceres also with greediness, but in her case a greediness for blood. This line is even more shocking for its reference to Virgil, 'prima Ceres ferro mortalis vertere terram/ instituit' (*G*.1.147-8). Here Ceres' role is to be the first to introduce agriculture, not sacrifice. For the reader acquainted with Virgil this is a

---

[226] For further information on the relationship between Ovid, Lucretius, and Empedocles see Hardie (1995).

shocking inversion; the gods in Ovid's *Fasti* are quite different, and more violent, than those of the *Georgics*.

To develop this theme of violent gods, *Fasti* 1.446 sees the gods punish birds for revealing auguries. The delay of 'suas' after 'mentes' emphasises that it is the thoughts of the gods that the birds reveal. The gods gloat over the sacrifice of animals, much as Ceres did, 'iuveruntque deos indicis exta sui' (*F*.1.450). This is a very unusual thought in the ancient world; Gods were commonly held to have sanctioned bird auguries cf. Xenophon *Memorabilia* 1.1.3. and Cicero *De Natura Deorum* 2.160, 'quamquam avis quasdam, et alites et oscines, ut nostri augures appellant, rerum augurandarum causa esse natas putamus' (Green 2004: 205 n.445-8).[227] The gods of the *Fasti* are quite different from Pythagoras' gods who do not condone sacrifice. The *Fasti* gods are angry and vicious and there is greater divine involvement in the origin of sacrifice. Yet, despite this contrast, the verb 'gaudeo' which Pythagoras employs to assert that the gods do not rejoice at sacrifice (*M*.15.129), is exactly the one that is used to describe Ceres' rejoicing at the death of the pig (*F*.1.349). If one reads the two accounts together, Pythagoras' claim that the gods do not rejoice in sacrifice is undercut by the description of them doing just that in the *Fasti.*

However, it is important when assessing the impact of Pythagoras' speech to consider the position of Pythagoreanism in Ovid's contemporary Rome: Pythagoras and Pythagoreanism were often lampooned and ridiculed. Dicaearchus mocks that Pythagoras' previous incarnation was a courtesan, Alco (Aulus Gellius *Attic Nights* 4.11.14), Cicero attacks Vatinius through his Pythagoreanism (*Vat*. 6). Our understanding of original Pythagoreanism is limited: Pythagoras, so far as we can tell, left no literature. Scholarship on the subject suggests that metempsychosis is the element most likely to be original to early Pythagoreanism, however, even this is debated (Burkert 1972: 120-3). The concept of Pythagoreanism appears to have snowballed over the centuries to incorporate other ideas. The one fragment of Diogenes Laertius (8.6) which suggests Pythagoras was anti-sacrifice is probably spurious (Burkert 1972: 129-

---

[227] See Green (2009: 158-165) for further discussion of this unusual view of bird sacrifice.

30).[228] Vegetarianism was also viewed as Pythagorean by the Augustan era, although, again, there is no evidence that this was part of original Pythagoreanism. However, to the philosopher Empedocles vegetarianism was an inescapable conclusion from the theory of metempsychosis; see fragments 122 and 124 (Wright 1995). The Roman anti-sacrifice tradition does not, other than the *Metamorphoses*, include specific references to Pythagoras; Ovid may have been doing something original to the Latin tradition.

Ovid exploits some of the humour inherent in the Pythagorean tradition by emphasising the vegetarianism element of the Pythagorean doctrine rather than the metempsychosis, which would be more in keeping with Ovid's theme of metamorphosis (Segal 1969: 280). The main message of Pythagoras' speech, that metempsychosis could lead one to eat one's relatives (*M*.15.459-61), seems curiously ineffective. It has four repetitions and tails off with 'hominum certe' (*M*.15.461). We have observed the references to vegetarianism and the Golden Age above (*M*.15.96-98), but in addition there are direct addresses pleading for vegetarianism, and an impassioned speech against meat-eating opens Pythagoras' discourse, the first line of which is ''Parcite, mortales, dapibus temerare nefandis/corpora!' (*M*.15.75-6). Indeed, it is not until sixty eight lines later (*M*.15.143) that Pythagoras moves away from decrying the practice of meat-eating. Vegetarianism can be a humorous subject for the ancients, for example Juvenal 3.229 and especially Horace *Satires* 2.6.63 (Segal 1969: 281), and Pythagoras is identified with the vegetarianism in both above examples. By choosing to emphasise vegetarianism Ovid slyly paints Pythagoras as a ridiculous character. We may wish to reconsider whether this anti-sacrifice discourse does effectively argue against animal sacrifice, if the narrator is subtly made a figure of fun. It also throws the *Fasti* into sharper relief; there the anti-sacrifice is told by the Ovidian narrator and without a humorous slant running throughout. As we shall see in the next part of this thesis, comedy is a strong element of the *Fasti*'s animal sacrifice narratives.

---

[228] For a discussion of the fragments and the reconstruction of Pythagorean philosophy see Kirk (1983), Burkert (1972), and Levy (1926).

In the first part of this chapter we have compared the two animal sacrifice discourses in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*. There is, however, one important element of the *Fasti* discourse on animal sacrifice which we have yet to survey. We turn now to the second part of this chapter: the focus on Priapus' attempted rape of Lotis. This story appears in the *Fasti*'s discourse on animal sacrifice but not in the *Metamorphoses'* Pythagorean discourse; although this story does appear briefly elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses*, (9.347-8), where a quite different version of the myth is given, (which we explore further below). In the rest of this chapter we examine the difference which the inclusion of the attempted rape of Lotis brings to the *Fasti*'s discourse on animal sacrifice. We also return to a recurring theme in both this thesis and the *Fasti*: episodes of sexual comedy. It has been our argument that the *Fasti* contains episodes of sexual comedy and many more such elements than have been previously noted. Here we approach one final episode of sexual comedy, this one however well noted by scholars. However, what is particularly significant about this episode is the disruption of tone it causes to the *Fasti*'s discourse on animal sacrifice. This then is a microcosm of the *Fasti*'s operation on the wider scale; the *Fasti* is a text characterised by flux and these episodes of sexual comedy are an important tool by which the fluctuation of tone is maintained.

We turn now to examine Lotis' attempted rape. The *Fasti* alone also features two misbehaving minor deities, Silenus and Priapus, who are involved in the aetiology for donkey sacrifice. This aetiology narrates Priapus' attempted rape of Lotis after a feast. Silenus is cast in the role of lecherous old man, 'te quoque, inextinctae Silene libidinis, urunt' (*F*.1.413) and arrives at the feast on a bow backed donkey, 'venerat et senior pando Silenus asello' (*F*.1.399). In this last quote the word order has Silenus, quite literally, in the middle of the donkey. Neither Silenus' mode of transport nor his behaviour are dignified. However, Priapus exposes himself to much greater ridicule when he is thwarted in the attempted rape of Lotis by an ill-timed braying donkey, 'ecce rudens rauco Sileni vector asellus/ intempestivos edidit ore sonos' (*F*.1.433-4) and becomes the object of priapic ridicule, 'deus obscena nimium quoque parte paratus/ omnibus ad lunae lumina risus erat' (*F*.1.437-8). These two characters are part of a cast of nymphs, satyrs and minor deities that wander through the *Fasti* helping to create

its complex and varying tone. But they are not the only inhabitants of this world; there is also the violent Ceres.[229] A complicated picture emerges in the *Fasti* with vicious major deities and ridiculous minor deities rubbing shoulders.

Priapus' attempted rape of Lotis is perhaps the most overtly comic tale we have surveyed in this thesis. Murgatroyd calls this tale 'much more memorable' (2005: 135) than the surrounding text. This is a good example of the unruly comedy of the *Fasti* pushing the history of Roman cult into quite a different direction: away from animal sacrifice and the grief-stricken end of Eurydice and instead to the laughter-ridden fate of Priapus. Whilst nominally discussing the reason for donkey sacrifice (the ill-timed bray we saw above) the attempted rape of Lotis is the longest and most striking feature of the *Fasti*'s passage on animal sacrifices. At nearly fifty lines it is the longest of any of the aetiologies and, although linked to the sacrifice of the ass, it is ill at ease with the overall structure of the *Fasti* passage on animal sacrifice and provides a considerable change of tone from that which precedes and follows. Immediately before the attempted rape of Lotis, Ovid is describing the more obscure forms of animal sacrifice (*F*.1.385-390), and following the episode is the aetiology of bird sacrifice (*F*.1.441-456). This bawdy attempted rape interrupts the pattern of gradually increasing disapproval of animal sacrifice, started with the pig, goat, sheep and cattle sacrifice and continued with bird sacrifice. This thesis argues that the episodes of sexual comedy are deliberately disruptive to the tone of the *Fasti*; here this episode disrupts the overall tonal progression of the animal sacrifice discourse. Murgatroyd memorably calls the Lotis and Priapus scene 'a bit of bedroom farce [that] provides a light-hearted start to the rapes in the *Fasti*' (2005: 83). This is one possible explanation for the tone and character of this myth; Ovid wished the first rape he described to start the theme of sexual comedy. This explanation works well to explain the nature of the narrative but can be further developed by looking at this episode in the context of the flux of the *Fasti*.

---

[229] Murgatroyd describes how Ovid 'uses [characters] (mainly mortals and gods) to build up a generally genial and light-hearted mythical world…one decidedly less dark and disturbing than the world of the *Metamorphoses*' (2005: 141).

The narrative follows the adventures of two protagonists, Priapus and Lotis, at a Bacchic festival. During the drinking and dancing Priapus spots Lotis, is consumed by lust for her and tries to communicate this with significant looks and gestures. She, proud and disdainful, does not deign to notice. When darkness falls and Lotis sleeps, Priapus attempts to rape her, but fails amid priapic embarrassment.[230] It is an overtly humorous narrative,[231] and one of the several tales of sexual frustration to which Fantham drew our attention (1983). One critic even goes so far as to describe the opening picture as having the potential to culminate in group sex (Murgatroyd 2005: 12). This seems somewhat of a stretch, but the opening is provocative, 'illa super suras tunicam collecta ministrat,/ altero dissuto pectus aperta sinu:/ exserit haec humerum, vestem trahit illa per herbas,/ impediunt teneros vincula nulla pedes' (*F*.1.407-410). Richlin comments on the visual nature of this (and other) rapes in the *Fasti* (Richlin 1992: 170). Here the nymphs are presented as stimulation for the male gaze. There is also a remarkable emphasis on the gaze of the potential rapist, 'hanc cupit, hanc optat, sola suspirat in illa, signaque dat nutu, sollicitatque notis' (*F*.1.417-18) (Richlin 1992: 170). We noted in both the rapes of Callisto and Europa that the reader's gaze was an important element of the tale, one which spanned both the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*. Here we find further evidence that the *Fasti* as well as the *Metamorphoses* utilises the appearance of *rapta* and the male gaze.

When looking at the Lotis and Priapus episode it is also important to note that a very similar account, so similar it is often referred to as a doublet, occurs in book six when Priapus approaches a sleeping figure and prepares to rape her, only to be exposed to the laughter of the crowd. This time, rather than Lotis, the sleeping figure is the goddess Vesta, and the goddess wakes up spontaneously rather than at a donkey bray. Otherwise the details of the two accounts are very closely aligned.[232] However, the effect is that of an intratextual twice-told tale. Like the

---

[230] Murgatroyd describes this episode as one in which minor characters come to the fore (2005: 159).

[231] Although interestingly it does not signal that it is a funny tale in a narrative introduction, unlike the rape of Omphale (*F*.2.304) or Vesta (*F*.6.320).

[232] The reasons for this seeming doublet have been a subject of scholarly debate. Murgatroyd argues that Ovid is 'taunting and mocking his readers, and one can hardly believe that he has the effrontery to produce one after another of these outrageously close coincidences' (2005: 86).

attempted rape of Lotis, that of Vesta also contains bawdy humour. There is double-entendre in 'ibat' (*F*.6.341) (the verb was used of both copulating and ejaculating), while 'longi' (*F*.6.341) 'in such a context surely conjures up the god's large penis' (Murgatroyd 2005: 88). The rape of Vesta is then also a part of the sexual comic thread of the rustic *Fasti*. One key point is that the second version, involving Vesta, has much greater political bite; so much so Murgatroyd comments that 'Ovid really sails close to the wind with Vesta' (2005: 91). This extra political dimension is largely due to the goddess Vesta; she was an important god to the Emperor Augustus. Indeed, the Vesta incident brings to the fore the notion of subversion and religious subversion. 'Religious subversion is common in this poem so concerned with religion' (Murgatroyd 2005: 91). Certainly Augustus was religiously invested in Vesta and when critics discuss the subversive elements of the *Fasti* they are mostly referring to the text's interesting relationship with the emperor Augustus.[233] The attempted rapes of Lotis and Vesta form part of an intratextual dialogue, and the different interpretations critics come to (the former a sexual comedy, the second a political challenge) again emphasises the sheer variety of tone the *Fasti* adopts.

Some critics argue that this aetiology is out of place in the text. Fantham goes so far as to say, as Priapus had no place in any official fertility ceremonies, that 'witty as it is, the story (of Priapus and Lotis) has no place in the Roman *Fasti*' (Fantham 1983: 202). The notion that Priapus is out of place in the *Fasti* is debatable. Green thinks Priapus was a well-respected fertility god (Green 2004: 183 n.391-440ii) and a possible character of Roman drama (2004: 182). Scholars generally suppose that Ovid knew an Alexandrian narrative about Priapus' pursuit of Lotis (Fantham 1983: 206), although we have no trace of it. In fact our only evidence for the existence of a Lotis and Priapus story comes from the *Fasti* and two lines in *Metamorphoses*, and the two texts give quite different versions. In the *Fasti* we have the text we are currently examining and in the *Metamorphoses* we have only a couplet on the attempted rape, told to explain the metamorphosis of Dryope who picks Lotis flowers from the plant that the nymph

Herbert-Brown surveys the role of Vesta in the *Fasti* more widely, particularly as relates to Augustus' appointment as Pontifex Maximus (1994: 66-81).

[233] Murgatroyd (2005: 92) sees the rape of Vesta as a part of the subtly subversive relationship the *Fasti* has with Augustus.

Lotis transforms into to escape Priapus' attentions, 'Lotis in hanc nymphe, fugiens obscena Priapi,/ contulerat versos, servato nomine, vultus' (*M*.9.347-8). Although these accounts are quite different in character there may be an intertextual pull between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* here. In the *Fasti* Priapus is described as 'hortorum decus et tutela' (*F*.1.415), whereas in the *Metamorphoses* he is chasing a nymph who ultimately turns into a flower. Could he be said to be attending to her also? Murgatroyd views the Lotis story as an example of Ovid's willingness to change major details in myths between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti,* but he goes further and asserts an intertextual link between the two, both thematic and verbal, with the joint allusion to Lotis' *vultus* and Priapus as *obscenus* and the cross-references to waters and trees (2005: 237). Here is the first really clear example we find in the twice-told tales and discourses of very different myth versions being employed in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*.

Fantham also raises the possibility that Ovid was influenced by Hellenistic paintings, such as that found in the Pompeian Casa dei Dioscuri, which shows a satyr approaching a nymph and lifting her dress, although in this instance the nymph is Hermaphroditus (1983: 198). Both of these possible sources suggest that Ovid's story may owe a debt to the Hellenistic tradition. Closer to home, this attempted rape scene also draws on motifs associated with Roman elegy. Lotis is the archetype of the proud mistress (Green 2004: 193 n.417-20) and the secret signs between elegiac lovers in Ovid's own elegies (*Am*.1.4.17-18) are similar to the signs Priapus gives Lotis (*F*.1.418). The emphasis on the different body parts of the nymphs (*F*.1.411-416) is also reminiscent of another of Ovid's elegies (*Amores* 1.5) and the description of Corinna. Roman Comedy is another possible source for this myth. The general setting of the attempted rape of Lotis, a festival setting, in the dark, fuelled by passion and wine, is very similar to that of Roman Comedy, cf. Plautus' *Aulularia* 792-5 and Terence's *Adelphoe* 470-1 (Green 2004: 195 n.421). Signs as a form of secret communication between lovers, such as those Priapus gives Lotis (*F*.1.418) appear, in literature, mainly in Comedy cf. Pl. *As*. 784 *Mil*. 123, Naev. *Tarentilla* fr. 76 Ribbeck (Green 2004: 193 n.418). Ovid also engages with some of the language of Comedy. 'Placidus', as noted above, was only previously used by Terence. 'Commereo' (*F*.1.362) is used,

prior to Ovid, in this sense of 'guilt of a certain event' only in early Comedy Pl. *Mos*. 516, Ter. *An*. 139, Thes. 3.1880.31ff. (Green 2004: 170 n.362).

However, there may be other intriguing sources. Green in his commentary highlights the debt that this episode owes to mime and satyr play.[234] The status of mime in the Roman world, and especially during the reign of Augustus, is a subject of some scholarly debate. McKeown attempts to demonstrate the aristocracy's involvement with mime by pointing to Julius Caesar and Augustus' sponsorship of the genre (McKeown 1979: 71-2). Green also notes that Pan and Silenus were championed as members of aristocratic families (2004: 184). Recently some scholars have also begun to argue that the great writers of the Augustan era did, in fact, draw upon these low, dramatic sources. The Lotis and Priapus episode is described with a heavy emphasis on gestures and movement and there is no direct speech (Green 2004: 182 n.391-440i), for example, 'signaque dat nutu, sollicitatque notis' (*F*.1.418). An ass also thwarts an affair in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* 9.14ff, and therefore Green suggests a possible adultery-mime tradition (2004: 200 n.433-4). Certainly the emphasis of the account is on Priapus' silent approach to the sleeping Lotis, although other critics offer different explanations of its function. Murgatroyd sees the long approach to Lotis as a device to build up comic tension that is then thwarted by the braying donkey (2005: 70). The *Fasti* then is a text which happily adopts an epic tone (such as in the apotheosis of Romulus) but also engages with 'low' fiction and theatre. This extraordinary breadth of tone demonstrates that the *Fasti* was truly, like the *Metamorphoses*, a text of flux.

This thesis has argued that comparison of these two discourses on animal sacrifice is fraught with interest and invitations to compare, despite their non-narrative nature. The similarity between the order pig, goat, sheep and cattle is a very strong invitation to compare the two accounts. In addition both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* describe a Golden Age which works structurally in tandem: describing animal sacrifice before describing a descent into meat eating.

---

[234] However, Fantham (1983: 200-1) suggests that mime was performed with dialogue whereas pantomime was danced without dialogue and that satyr plays were restrained in action and language (198).

Both accounts also offer unusual versions of these pre-animal sacrifices. The very different role of the gods in these two discourses is particularly of interest, especially as similar diction provides an invitation to compare between them. We have also seen that intertexts with other texts outside of the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* are a particularly strong element of these discourses, in particular with Virgil's *Georgics* and Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*. This thesis has also argued that the episodes of sexual comedy are deliberately disruptive to the tone of the *Fasti*; the attempted rape of Lotis disrupts the heightening of tone. This attempted rape also demonstrates the breadth of genres with which the *Fasti* engages, from epic to low comic genres. The theme of sexual comedy in the *Fasti* is one of the principal ways in which this text is characterised as a text of flux.

Conclusion

We began this thesis by looking at the work previously done in comparing the twice-told tales in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*. We noted that, excluding the rapes of Persephone, little work had been done in this field. The two major previous practitioners of the comparison of the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* were Heinze and Hinds. However Heinze had presented a generic distinction of the rapes of Persephone, which he had extended to the rest of both texts. This comparison had been heavily criticised as simplistic and ultimately a false method of examining the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*. Hinds' reassessment added nuance to Heinze's method and also found in favour of a generic distinction between the two Ovidian rapes of Persephone. The large question that Hinds' work left unanswered was whether his findings in the rapes of Persephone applied to the other twice-told tales and/or the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* as a whole. This was the crucial question asked of Hinds' scholarship by critics; Nicoll (1988: 246) is one such example. Now that we have surveyed the twice-told tales we are in position to address this question.

We have found all of the twice-told tales we have surveyed to contain a strong intertextual pull between the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* versions. There are invitations to compare with strongly similar diction. Some of the twice-told tales have been highly interconnected: for example in the rapes of Callisto narratives we saw how Jupiter of the *Metamorphoses* echoed the language of Diana in the *Fasti*. Others have contained less sustained similarity but have been drawn together at crucial moments of the narrative. The rape of Europa is an example of three very different narratives which nevertheless all present the image of Europa upon the bull's back. However, we have also argued that Ovid consciously varies between his two versions of the same narrative. Once again, at this point of contact we are invited to compare the narrative closely, where we find variation in the precise points of detail as to the placement of Europa's hands. Here this thesis has shown that Hinds' 1987 argument that the rapes of Persephone were connected intertextually can be extended to the other twice-told tales.

Both Heinze and Hinds argued for a generic division between the rapes of Persephone, and Heinze argued that these distinctions applied more generally to the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*. For Heinze the generic difference was characterised, in chief, by the following. The *Fasti*, and elegy as a whole, was: passive, subjective, personal, full of lamentation, irreverent to the gods, had landscape described as idyllic. The *Metamorphoses*, and epic as a whole was: active, objective, concise, without poetic cliché, had landscape described as grandiose. Hinds modified and added nuance to Heinze's generic criteria in his examination of the rapes of Persephone. He argued broadly in favour of a generic distinction between this twice-told tale arguing that the *Fasti* featured more lamentation whilst the 'angry exercise of supernatural power' (1987: 107) was more emphasised in the *Metamorphoses*. He also demonstrated that both versions of this twice-told tale engaged in meta-poetical comment about their generic status (1987: 126).

Having extended our gaze to the other twice-told tales in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* this thesis also finds, broadly, in favour of Hinds' generic distinction between the two texts. We have noted two reasonably consistent differences between the twice-told narratives of the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*: divine action and an emphasis on violence and the visual representation of violence are both more prominent in the *Metamorphoses*. The *Metamorphoses*' interest in the sensational and graphic can be witnessed in the beautiful Callisto's transformation into a hideous bear. The emphasis was in that text upon Callisto's appearance throughout, highlighting the text's interest in describing the visual transformation. We also saw Hippolytus' grotesque dismemberment, told in a level of detail that rendered the account graphic and shocking.

Divine action is also important to the *Metamorphoses*' narrative of the rape of Callisto: the divine action of Jupiter and Juno were very much downplayed in the *Fasti*. That is not to say that divine action is absent from the *Fasti*: but like *arma*, often presented in a reduced or changed form. Indeed Diana's action is important to Callisto's narrative in the *Fasti*, as is the divine action more generally in Romulus' apotheosis in that text. However, when held in comparison with the

Metamorphoses it is noticeable that there is less divine action in both of these examples.

However, it should be noted that although divine action is more prominent in the *Metamorphoses* versions of the twice-told tales this is not necessarily dignified behaviour, nor is it angry divine action, as Hinds noted was more important to the *Metamorphoses* version of the rapes of Persephone. Instead quite frequently the emphasis on divine action is either humorous (Jupiter's ridiculous transformation into a bull) or a somewhat critical view of the gods' behaviour (Arachne's version of the rape of Europa). This is also in contradistinction to Heinze's views that divinity was only dampened in the *Fasti* (1960: 311).

There is, however, one important caveat in our adoption of Hinds' generic distinction for the other twice-told tales. We have found lamentation (which Hinds found to be more prominent in the *Fasti* narrative of the rape of Persephone) to be an unreliable way to distinguish more generally between the twice-told tales. Hinds found in favour of lamentation being elegiac lament in the *Fasti* rape of Persephone, but in comparing the twice-told tales we have more often found lamentation, a tragic-style lamentation, to be more prominent in the *Metamorphoses,* for example with the grief of Hersilia and Egeria.

We have found that the *Fasti* avoids, for the most part, the sensational elements which the *Metamorphoses* highlights. Instead we have seen that, where the *Metamorphoses* chooses tragedy, the *Fasti* chooses comedy. We have argued that, for the *Fasti*, the theme of sexual comedy is much more prevalent than was previously imagined. It is present in both Europa and Callisto, neither of which had previously been identified as part of this thread. This theme of sexual comedy in the *Fasti* and its prevalence in that text would benefit from further research.

The prevalence of this theme of sexual comedy has been argued by this thesis to be part of the destabilising tactics of the *Fasti*, creating a state of flux in the tone of that text. Flux has been argued to be an important theme of the *Fasti*, strongly promoted by the generic play of that text and its interactions with such a wide

variety of texts from epic to low comic genres. This creates such a variety of tone and style of narrative that the *Fasti* is maintained in a state of constant flux. The flux of the *Fasti*, outside of the confines of the twice-told tales, could also prove a fruitful area for further research.

However we have also seen that both texts are very interested in playing with their nominal genre and engage with elements of other genres. Where Heinze posited a simple epic versus elegiac distinction we have shown that the two texts problematize their genre deliberately when they are in direct comparison with each other. For example, we have seen the removal of Mars' *arma* in the *Metamorphoses* version of the apotheosis of Romulus and the strong engagement with epic motifs, such as the storm, in the *Fasti*. The *Fasti* also problematizes its engagement with elegiac precedent when it chooses to downgrade Venus' role in the twice-told tales.

Close-reading the twice-told tales in comparison has also been shown by this thesis to enhance our appreciation of both passages. To take just a few of many examples, the different spin which Mars puts upon the reason for Romulus' apotheosis (his destiny and his filial relationship with Mars in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* respectively) has been shown to enhance our understanding of the impetus of the two versions of this tale, particularly as regards Remus. In Callisto's rape we saw the remarkable preponderance of feminine pronouns and other signifiers in the *Metamorphoses* version, compared to the *Fasti*'s preference for highlighting Callisto's relationship with Diana. In Hippolytus' death and rebirth we noted that Diana had direct speech in the *Metamorphoses*, and none in the *Fasti*, instead Aesculapius was addressing Diana. In the two discourses on animal sacrifice we remarked upon the work the verb 'gaudeo' was made to do, in the *Fasti* it was used to describe Ceres' rejoicing at the death of the pig (*F.*1.349), whereas Pythagoras employed it to assert that the gods do not rejoice at sacrifice (*M.*15.129).

We have further argued that the relationship between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* is essential to our understanding of the two texts. In addition to arguing for tonal flux in the *Fasti*, we have also seen a sort of perpetual motion promoted by

the positioning of the twice-told tales. The concentration of twice-told tales at the end of the *Metamorphoses* pushes forward to the beginning of the *Fasti*. The cluster of twice-told tales told at the end of the *Fasti* then pushes us back into the *Metamorphoses* again. This distribution of the tales throughout the texts creates a circular reading. As a result the reader is prevented from finding a priority between the two texts; neither the *Metamorphoses* nor the *Fasti* lays claim to be the original version.

This thesis has expanded Heinze and Hinds' work to include most of the twice-told tales and argued for the importance and usefulness of reading the twice-told tales together. We have seen epic almost overset the *Fasti*'s elegy in the apotheosis of Romulus. We have witnessed the important intertextual movement between the two rapes of Callisto. We have played the 'spot-the difference' game of Ovidian variation in Europa's depiction upon the bull. Hippolytus' remarkable first-person narrative has come under increased scrutiny from its comparison to the third-person narrative in the *Fasti*. We have demonstrated the importance that positioning of the twice-told tales plays in increasing an intertextual reading of the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*. We have also argued that intertexuality is so embedded between the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* that one can fruitfully compare between non-narrative episodes. Above we have attempted to prove Lewis in Shakespeare's King John wrong; Ovid's twice-told tales are not dull but fascinating.

Works Cited

Adams, J. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (Duckworth)

Anderson, A. 1928. 'Heracles and His Successors: A Study of a Heroic Ideal and the Recurrence of a Heroic Type', *HSCPh*, 39: 7-58

Anderson, W. S. 1969. 'Review of Bernbeck: Beobachtungen zur Darstellungsart in Ovids Metamorphosen', *American Journal of Philology*, 90: 352-355

⸺ 2002. 'Resistance to Recognition and 'Privileged Recognition' in Terence', *The Classical Journal*, 98(1): 1-8

Austin, K. R. C. (ed.). 1991. *Poetae Comici Graeci* (Berlin)

Baldry, H. 1952. 'Who Invented the Golden Age', *The Classical Quarterly*, 46: 83-92

Barchiesi, A. 1991. 'Discordant Muses', *PCPS*, n.s.37: 1-21

⸺ 1997. *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse* (California)

⸺ 2001. *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and other Latin Poets* (London: Duckworth)

⸺ 2005. *Ovidio: Metamorfosi, Volume I (Libri I-II) Traduzione di Ludovica Koch* (Milan: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla/Arnoldo Mondadori Editore)

Barrett, W. 1964. *Euripides Hippolytus* (Oxford)

Barsby, J. 1978. *Ovid* (Oxford)

Barthes, R. 1975. 'The Theory of the Text', *Untying the Text: a Post-Structuralist Reader*, (ed.) Young, R. (Routledge: London) 31:47

Bernbeck, E. 1967. 'Beobachtungen zur Darstellungsart in Ovids Metamorphosen', *Zetemata*, 43: 127-131

Blunt, J. M. 1977. *A Commentary on Ovid Metamorphoses Two* (Uithoorn: J. C. Gieben)

Bömer, F. 1986. *P. Ovidius Naso* (Heidelburg: Carl Winter)

Boyd, B. (ed.). 2002. *Brill's Companion to Ovid* (Leiden: Brill)

Boyle, A. 2003. *Ovid and the Monuments: A Poet's Rome* (Bendigo)

Bremmer, J. 1987. *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* (London: Croom Helm)

Burkert, W. 1972. *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press)

Campbell, M. 1991. *Moschus, Europa*. *Altertumswissenschaftliche Texte und Studien Band 19* (Olms-Weidemann)

Carter, J. B. 1909. 'The Death of Romulus', *American Journal of Archaeology*, 13(1): 19-29

Cixous, H. 1988 (repr.). 'Sorties', *Modern Criticism and Theory*, (ed.) Lodge, D. (London)

Clarke, W. 1972. 'Intentional Rhyme In Vergil and Ovid', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 103: 49-77

Coleman, R. 1971. 'Structure and Intention in the Metamorphoses', *Classical Quarterly*, 21: 461-477

Conte, G. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and other Latin Poets*, (ed.) Charles Segal (Ithaca: Cornell University Press)

⸺ 1994. *Genres and Readers: Lucretius, Love Elegy, Pliny's Encyclopedia* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press)

Davis, P. 1995. 'Rewriting Euripides: Ovid, Heroides 4', *Scholia*, 4: 41-55

⸺ 2004. *Rome's Religious History: Livy, Tacitus & Ammianus on their Gods* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Degrassi, A. 1963. *Inscriptiones Italiae* 13.2, 2 vols (Rome)

Fantham, E. 1983. 'Sexual Comedy in Ovid's Fasti: Sources and Motivation', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 87: 185-216

Feeney, D. C. 1984. 'The Reconciliations of Juno', *The Classical Quarterly*, 34 (1): 179-194

⸺ 1992) 'Si licet et fas est: Ovid's Fasti and the Problem of Free Speech under the Pricipate', *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, (ed.) Powell, A. (London) 1-25

⸺ 2004. 'Interpreting Sacrificial Ritual in Roman Poetry', *Rituals in Ink*, (ed.) Barchiesi, A. (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner) 1-21

Foley, H. 2001. *Female Acts in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton)

Fondation pour le Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae. 1988. *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (vol.) 4* (Artemis and Winkler: Zurich)

Fränkel, H. 1969. *Ovid: A Poet Between Two Worlds* (Berkeley: University of California Press)

Frazer, J. 1973. *Publius Ovidius Naso: Fastorum Libri Sex, with a Translation and Commentary* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag)

Gale, M. 2000. *Virgil on the Nature of Things: The Georgics, Lucretius and the Didactic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Galinsky, G. 1975. *Ovid's Metamorphoses: An Introduction to the Basic Aspects* (University of California Press)

Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press)

Gee, E. 2000. *Ovid, Aratus and Augustus: Astronomy in Ovid's Fasti* (Cambridge)

Gosling, A. 2002. 'Sending up the Founder: Ovid and the Apotheosis of Romulus', *Acta Classica*, vol. 45: 51-70

Green, S. 2004. *Ovid, Fasti 1: A Commentary* (Leiden: Brill)

—— 2008. 'Save Our Cows? Augustan Discourse and Animal Sacrifice in Ovid's Fasti', *Greece & Rome*, (55): 39-54

—— 2009. 'Malevolent Gods and Promethean Birds: Contesting Augury in Augustus's Rome', *TAPA*, (139): 147-167

Habinek, T. 1990. 'Sacrifice and Society and Virgil's Ox-Born Bees', *Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer*, (eds) Griffith, M. & Mastronarde, D. (Atlanta)

Hardie, P. 1993. *The Epic Successors Of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition* (Cambridge)

—— 1995. 'The Speech of Pythagoras in Ovid's Metamorphoses 15: Empedoclean Epos', *The Classical Quarterly*, 45: 204-214

—— (ed.). 2002. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

—— 2002(a). *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Harrison, S. 1988. 'A Tragic Europa?: Horace, Odes 3.27', *Hermes*, 116: 427-434

—— 2002. 'Ovid and Genre: Evolutions of an Elegist', *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, (ed.) Hardie, P. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 79-94

Heath, M. 1989. *Unity in Greek Poetics* (Oxford)

Heinze, R. 1960 (repr.). 'Ovids Elegische Erzählung', *Vom Geist der Römertums*, (Darmstadt) 308-403

Henrichs, A. 1987. 'Three Approaches to Greek Mythography', *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, (ed.) Bremmer, J. (London: Croom Helm) 242-277

Herbert-Brown, G. 1994. *Ovid and the Fasti: An Historical Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

⸺ (ed.). 2002. *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillenium* (Oxford: Oxford
University Press)

Hinds, S. 1987. *The Metamorphosis of Persephone* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

⸺ 1992. 'Arma in Ovid's Fasti', *Arethusa*, 25: 81-153

⸺ 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Hopkinson, N. 1988. *A Hellenistic Anthology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Horsfall, N. 1979. 'Epic and Burlesque in Ovid Met. 8.260f.', *The Classical Journal*, 74(4): 319-332

⸺ 2000. *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary* (Leiden: Brill)

Jocelyn, H. 1989. 'Romulus and the Di Genitales (Ennius, Annales 110-111 Skutsch)', *Studies in Latin Literature and its tradition in honour of C.O. Brink*, (eds) Diggle, J., Hall, J., & Jocelyn, H. (Cambridge) 39-65

Johnson, W. 1996. 'The Rapes of Callisto', *The Classical Journal*, 92: 9-24

Joshel, S. 1992. 'The Female Body and the Body Politic', *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*, (ed.) Richlin, A. (Oxford) 112-130

Katz, J. 1998. 'Testimonia Ritus Italici: Male Genitalia, Solemn Declarations, and a New Latin Sound Law', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 98: 183-217

Kirk, G., Raven, J., Schofield, M. 1983. *The Prescocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Knox, P. E. 1986. *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

— (ed.). 2006. *Oxford Readings in Ovid* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Koch, C. 1960. *Religio. Studien zu Kult und Glauben der Römer* (Nuremberg)

Laird, A. 2000. 'Design and Designation in Virgil's Aeneid, Tacitus' Annals, and Michelangelo's Conversion of Saint Paul', *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations*, (ed.) Sharrock, A. (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 143-70

Levy, I. 1926. *Recherches sur les Sources de la Légende de Pythagore* (Paris: Leroux)

Lewis and Short. 1979. *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

Little, D. 1970. 'Richard Heinze: Ovids Elegische Erzählung', *Ovids Ars Amatoria und Remedia Amoris: Untersuchngen zum Aufbau*, (ed.) Zinn, E. (Stuttgart) 64-105

— 1970(a). 'The Speech of Pythagoras in Metamorphoses 15 and the Structure of the Metamorphoses', *Hermes*, 98: 340-60

Littlewood, R. 1980. 'Ovid and the Ides of March (Fasti 3.523-710): A Further Study in the Artistry of the Fasti', *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History II*, (ed.) Deroux, C. (Brussels: Latomus)

— 2006. *A Commentary on Ovid's Fasti Book Six* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1987. *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

— 1989. *Words and the Poet* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Maass, E. 1958. *Commentariorum in Aratum Reliquiae* (Berlin)

MacKendrick, P. 1953. 'Review of The Nature of Roman Comedy: A Study in Popular Entertainment by George E. Duckworth', *The American Journal of Philology*, 74(4): 423-426

Martin, C. 1985. 'A Reconsideration of Ovid's Fasti', *ICS*, 10: 261-74

Martindale, C. 1993. *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

McKeown, J. 1979. 'Augustan Elegy and Mime', *PCPhS*, 25: 71-84

— 1984. 'Fabula proposito nulla tegenda meo', *Ovid's Fasti and Augustan Politics. Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, (eds) Woodman, A. & West, D. (Bristol)

Merkelbach, R. 1967. *Fragmenta Hesiodea* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Merli, E. 2000. *Arma canant alii: Materia epica e narrazione elegiaca nei fasti di Ovidio* (Florence: Università degli studi di Firenze Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità)

Miller, J. 1991. *Ovid's Elegiac Festivals. Studien zur klassichen Philologie 55* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang)

— 1992. 'The Fasti and Hellenistic Didactic: Ovid's Variant Aetiologies', *Arethusa*, 25: 11-31

— 2003. 'The Reception of the Fasti in Neo-Latin Christian Calendar Poems and the Humanist Poets', *International Journal for the Classical Tradition*, 10: 173-86

Mulvey, L. 1975. 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema', *Screen*, 16.3: 6-18

Murgatroyd, P. 2005. *Mythical and Legendary Narrative in Ovid's Fasti* (Leiden: Brill)

Murgia, C. 1985. 'Imitation and Authenticity in Ovid: Metamorphoses 1.477 and Heroides 15', *The American Journal of Philology*, 106: 456-474

Myers, S. 1994. *Ovid's Causes: Cosmogony and Aetiology in the Metamorphoses* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press)

— 2009. *Ovid. Metamorphoses, Book XIV* (Cambridge)

Nash, C. 1990. 'Slaughtering the Subject: Literature's Assault on Narrative', *Narrative in Culture: The Uses of Storytelling in the Sciences, Philosophy, and Literature*, (ed.) Nash, C. (London) 199-218

Newlands, C. 1995. *Playing with Time: Ovid and the Fasti* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press)

— 2000. 'Connecting the Disconnected: Reading Ovid's Fasti', *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations*, (eds) Sharrock, A. & Morales, H. (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Nicoll, W. 1988. 'Review of Stephen Hinds: The Metamorphosis of Persephone', *The Classical Review*, 38: 245-247

Otis, B. 1970. *Ovid as an Epic Poet* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Penella, R. 1990. 'Vires/Robur/Opes and Ferocia in Livy's Account of Romulus and Tullus Hostilius', *The Classical Quarterly*, 40(1): 207-213

Radt, S. 1985. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Vol. 3 Aeschylus* (Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht)

Relihan, J. 1988. 'Fulgentius Mitologiae 1.20-21', *The American Journal of Philology*, 109(2): 229-230

Ribbeck, O. 1962 (repr.). *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta* (Hildesheim)

Richlin, A. 1992. 'Reading Ovid's Rapes', *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*, (ed.) Richlin, A. (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 158-79

Robinson, M. 2003. 'Festivals, Fools and the Fasti: The Quirinalia and the Feriae Stultorum (Ovid, Fasti 2.475-532)', *Aevum Antiquum*, N.S.3: 609-621

— 2010. *A Commentary on Ovid's Fasti Book Two* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Rosati, G. 1999. 'Form in Motion: Weaving the Text in the Metamorphoses', *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on the Metamorphoses and its Reception. Cambridge Philological Society Suppl. 23*, (eds) Hinds, S., Hardie, P., & Barchiesi, A. (Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society) 240-253

Rosenmeyer, P. 1995. 'Enacting the Law: Plautus' Use of the Divorce Formula on Stage', *Phoenix*, 49(3): 201-217

Segal, C. 1969. 'Myth and Philosophy in the Metamorphoses', *American Journal of Philology,* 90: 257-292

— 1984. 'Senecan Baroque: The Death of Hippolytus in Seneca, Ovid and Euripides', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 114: 311-325

Sharrock, A. 2000. 'Intratextuality: Texts, Parts and (W)holes in Theory', *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations*, (eds) Sharrock, A. & Morales, H. (Oxford Oxford University Press) 1-39

Skutsch, O. 1968. *Studia Enniana* (Athlone Press)

— 1985. *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* (Oxford)

Solodow, J. 1988. *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press)

Syme, R. 1978. *History in Ovid* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

Taylor, A. (ed.). 2000. *Shakespeare's Ovid: The Metamorphoses in the Plays and Poems* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Thomas, R. 1991. 'The "Sacrifice" at the End of the Georgics, Aristaeus and Vergilian Closure', *Classical Philology*, 86: 211-18

Tränkle, H. 1963. 'Elegisches in Ovids Metamorphosen', *Hermes*, 91: 465-476

Wheeler, S. 1999. *A Discourse of Wonders, Audience and Performance in Ovid's Metamorphoses* (Penn.)

Wills, J. 1998. 'Divided Allusion: Virgil and the Coma Berenices', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 98: 277-305

Wiseman, T. 1988. 'Satyrs in Rome? The Background to Horace's Ars Poetica' *JRS*, 78: 1-13

⸻ 1995. *Remus: A Roman Myth* (Cambridge)

⸻ 2004. *The Myths of Rome* (University of Exeter Press)

Wright, M. 1995. *Empedocles, The Extant Fragments* (Bristol)

Wyke, M. 2002. *The Roman Mistress: Ancient and Modern Representations* (OUP)